

4139.6
3

3

Allyffe A SECOND
DEFENCE

O F

Ministerial Conformity

TO THE

Church of ENGLAND:

In Answer to

Mr. *Calamy's* Objections a-
gainst the FIRST ;

IN HIS

Pretended VINDICATION of the
10th Chapter of his *Abridgment*
of Mr. *Baxter's* Life and Times.

L O N D O N,

Printed by *W.S.* for *Richard Wilkin* at the
King's-Head in *S. Paul's Church-yard*. 1705.

A SECOND
DEFENCE

OF
Ministerial Conformity
TO THE
Church of ENGLAND.

In Answer to
Mr. Calamy's
gainst the
; 
LONDON

Preceded VINDICATION of the
10th Chapter of his Sermon
of Mr. Baxter's Life and Times.

LONDON
Printed by W.S. for Richard Widdowes the
King's Head in St. Pauls Church-yard. 1707.

T H E
P R E F A C E

I*T is a very sad and melancholy Scene, that the Christian World, and our own Nation in particular, doth present us with. It is an Observation and Complaint made by all good Men, that a mighty deluge of barefaced Infidelity, and impudent and daring Wickedness hath invaded the Land, and hath run through all the Parts and Corners of it. And together with this, a narrow and selfish Spirit, which inclines Men to center all in themselves, or to direct all their main and chief designs to advance their own Interest, and to set up their own little Concerns above the publick Weal, and the Interest of Religion itself. And hence arise grievous Jealousies, and Suspensions towards those, who they think do oppose or cross their Expectations. And Hatred, Malice and Revenge against all that are not in their Interest or Way; which will naturally terminate in Quarrels and Contentions. So that all the motions of such Men tend to nothing else, but meer conflagration, and*

The PREFACE.

to exasperate, and provoke, and destroy. And thus it will be till there is a change made in Mens Spirits, and till by sound Wisdom and good Consideration of things, they are brought to a more Christian Mind, and better Government of themselves.

Passion is a most exorbitant thing, if it be not timely allayed. And Revenge is meer Wild-fire, and where such malignity of Nature continues, it will make Men delight in nothing more, than in Oppression and Harm, and in offering Violence to others. While Self-interest is made the Standard of right and wrong, that must be promoted by any kind of means, let all besides sink or swim; And there shall be no patience with any thing, that doth not bear a Conformity to it. And while Men are acted by Pride or Covetousness, by the love of Empire or Domination, they will be of course Enemies to all, that will not serve, or that never so little seem to oppose, their greedy Minds, and haughty Ambition. Nay, where there is only a Love to Vice and Licentiousness, it will make Men have but an indifferent Respect to those, that will not run with them into the same excess of Riot, or that by their greater strictness seem to reproach their profane Liberty.

True Religion is the only effectual cure of all this. Religion that is not only a bare Denomination, that doth not consist in meer Notion or
Pro-

THE PREFACE.

Profession, but that which doth become a vital Principle in Men, when the Principles of it are Incorporated into the Complexion of our Minds, when it restores our Natures, and when the temper of our Spirits is formed by it, then it prevails mightily, and works amain, and sets all to rights in this little World, and diffuseth its noble Influences to all about. And most certainly it is never genuine and true, till it doth thus, till it refines the Spirits of Men and reforms their Lives. But when it is in its subject what it is in it self, and when a Man chargeth himself thoroughly with it; when he is not contented only with a Scheme of it in his Head or in his Books, but liveth and governs himself by it, then it doth a Man good indeed; and all that are about him are something the better for it. For Religion is Truth, Righteousness, and Goodness; and they that live according to their Religion, do nothing, but what Truth, Righteousness, and Goodness dictate to be done.

Now true Religion, as our Saviour hath determined it, is nothing else but Love, Love to God, and Love to our Neighbour. It first unites us to God, and makes him our Center, and raiseth us up to him and to an imitation of him. And then it proceeds to compose the Mind, and to make all order within; It tempers the Hurly-burly of impotent Passions, and is a Poise and

The PREFACE.

Ballance to them. And then it sheweth itself abroad, and makes Men not only sober and just, but of a kind and good Behaviour; It is, in other Words, Candor, Equity and Moderation; It makes Men dwell in Love, and to do that which is lovely; It is humble, and modest, and meek and gentle; And it casts out all unreasonable Jealousies, and Suspicions; It gives Allowances for the infirmities and mistakes of Men; It makes fair and candid constructions of Mens Actions and Designs, where there is not apparent Evidence to determine another way. It is ingenuous, tender-hearted, pure, peaceable and easie to be entreated, as the Apostle describes the Wisdom from above to be. This is the true Mould that it casts the Mind into; purifying it by Abstraction from gross matter, delivering it from the incendiary Principles of Humour, Lust and Passion, that make such havock and desolation in the World.

But now what shall we say? Sometimes false Zeal goeth for this true and noble Fire; and Men are really worse for that, which they call their Religion, while they set up something in the room of it; which makes them wrathful and furious, spiteful and quarrelsome, and burthensome to those about them, so that their Religion is not half so good, as common Good Nature itself. This is too much the Case among some, of all Parties, Conditions and Persuasions.

*Tea, sometimes good Men themselves, through
the*

THE PREFACE.

the weakness of their Minds or wrong Notions that they have imbibed of Men and Things, or by that over-eager and injudicious Zeal, and sometimes rash and turbulent Passions, which their Religion yet hath not been strong enough to correct, give a great deal of disquiet to those about them, and give too much occasion to rough censures and hard dealing with themselves. For if they don't treat others with that religious Respect, as becomes their Profession, they must expect quickly to be paid home in their own Coin. Sometimes also Men don't understand one another: And sometimes the nature and value of things is not rightly perceived; so that they lay a great weight upon little things, and contend about them with as much heat, and Earnestness, as if they were matters of the greatest consequence. And this is always worse, when with mistaken Notions or Esteem of things, there is also joyned a natural Stiffness, and high Stomach; and the Tradition of our Fathers is added thereunto. From these, and such like Causes it comes to pass, that we have at this day so many bitter Dissentions and Quarrels among us, both in Church and State, to the great disturbance of the Publick Peace, exposing us to the Malice of our Enemies, and the Prejudice of true Religion. Hence we have State-Factions and Church-Divisions, Sidings and Separations, and fierce and bitter Animosities so rise amongst us.

The PREFACE.

But will it be always thus? Have not we had yet Experience enough of the Folly and Mischief of these things? But must we pay dearer for it still, before we will restrain our violent Passions against one another, and remit of this stiff and turbulent Zeal, this rough and inflexible Humour, and the pursuit of our own little and private Interests? When all should be sacrificed and a great deal more, for the publick Peace and our holy Religion Sake.

It is a miserable thing that there can be no Accomodation of our foolish and unchristian Differences. Is our Wound utterly incurable? Is there no Balm for healing? Is there no way to be taken? No Method that can be found out, by all our wise Men, to put things into a better Temper amongst us? Sure we must not give over the World so. If those who are especially concerned, would set their Heads and Hearts to work, according to the Obligation of Christian Prudence and Charity, I hope it might be found, that as bad as our Breaches are in some respect, yet there might be some Remedies used, that in good part at least, would be effectual to cement and heal us.

But this is not the way, perhaps will some say, that we have taken here, but a down-right Contradiction to all this high Pretence of so great a desire of Union and Accomodation. To which I reply, that till other Methods can be found

out,

The PREFACE.

out and pitcht upon, which might give us a fair and more visible Prospect of Success, this which we have done may be of considerable Use.

It is always a matter of very great Importance, and for the Interest of Religion itself, to have the Offices, and Ministers thereof free from blame. If these are exposed to slighting and censure it will make people, if not abhor, yet very little to value the Offerings of the Lord. And this is much more considerable, with respect to those of a National constitution, than the private performances of particular Men; As much as the Acts that relate to a whole Body are abundantly more considerable, than those of any particular member. If those are found faulty, it reflects upon all. And it naturally tends to make rents and divisions from the Body, when Union cannot be maintained without partaking in the same common Crimes. And therefore Men should be very careful, what they do in this matter. And they should be fully sure, they are in the right, before they find fault. They should be very sure that faults are there, and such as deserve to be publickly exposed too, before they pretend, or go about to shew them. It is not every little surmise, that can justify a Man in his censure of his Neighbour; and much less can every little doubt, or scruple bear one out in opposition to a publick Act. If Men will promote prejudices against others, they had need be sure there

The PREFACE.

is just Cause for them. And no Man can be blamed for being over-officious, to vindicate himself from such Imputations, that may tend to diminish his Character or Calling before others, if he were alone by himself; and much less when so many more are concerned in the same Charge; and when the Consequences are so fatal, and lead to so much Confusion, to the Overthrow of Charity and good Will, in which so much of the true Spirit of the Gospel consists. It is plain to common Observation, that the Dissatisfaction that many have conceived at the Publick Offices and Ministrations, is one great and main Cause of those Divisions that are amongst us, to the great Violation of the Publick Peace and Union. And why then should Mr. Calamy think strange at me or any one else, that we endeavour to vindicate our selves from those Criminations that are apt to create such Disgust to our Persons and Character: And to clear up our Compliance with the National Establishment, to satisfie those that are of another Mind from it, and to induce them to have favourable Thoughts at least of the Offices of our Religion, and our Ministration thereof, for the promoting of Peace and Union amongst us, in which, as 'tis said, our Religion it self is so much concerned?

We

The PREFACE.

We think Mr. Calamy hath very much contributed to the contrary of all this, and to perpetuate our Divisions by what he hath done. For we still are, and must be of the mind, till we see reason to the contrary, that he hath given a very unjust Representation of Conformity, and of the Principles and Practices of Conformists; and hath aggravated things beyond all measure; and by his heavy Aggravations hath laid a Load upon the Church Constitution, which was never intended by the legal Establishment; and in which therefore we cannot otherwise think, but that he hath done a very ill part. This Representation that he hath given of the Principles and Practices of the Conforming Clergy, can gratifie none but such as are Enemies to their Ministry in general, and to the work of God in the Land, carried on by them. Besides the unreasonable Contests that it procures, to the violation of Peace and Charity, it hath many other mischievous Effects upon a great many Persons. It being not only the Vices of some Clergymen that meet with Invective, as indeed they justly deserve, but our Office and Character being hereby exposed to Rebuke and Censure; so that though our Consciences be never so clear in what we have done, we are thought to be Men of no Conscience, or to be very blind, and like to make but very blind Guides of others.

Tea,

The PREFACE.

Tea, and the more inoffensive our Conversations are, we are thought by some to be so much the more dangerous Instruments, for that very reason. And many of the Dissenting way being by this means more prejudiced and enraged against the Church Ministry; and for want of other Helps oftentimes for their Instruction and Edification, they fall into the worst of Sectarianism, and embrace any Odd Notion that can be offered to them. And many others that are prejudiced against the Dissenters, and the way of Non-conformity upon divers Accounts, finding the Church and Ministry thus exposed, and rendered ridiculous also, make use of these things to harden themselves in opposition to all Religion. Believing the Church still to be far the best; yet by these Representations that are made of it, they are taught to say, Bad is the best. And whensoever we go about to convince them of, and reprove them for their sins, they take up this, and throw it back upon us. They jeer at our Ministry, and yet not knowing where to mend themselves, they forsake, and cast off all. These are not Melancholy Fancies, but real Consequences of Mr. Calamy's performance. And glad should we have been if there had been no occasion given us to complain farther thereof, the former prejudices having given too much occasion for matters of this Nature before.

But

The PREFACE.

But now Mr. Calamy hath begun this Contest anew without any Provocation, when the Toleration had laid all this matter asleep; and hath made things yet worse by summing up all that was ever said or objected with any colour against Conformity, and heaping together all the most Odious Representations of our Practice; and this with all the Spirit and Vigour he could, to render it vile in the sight of all; tho' not by a direct and downright Charge, yet by Oblique and Artful Inuendo's, which serve as well to the same end, to all intents and purposes. And tho' Mr. Calamy saith, His Abridgment hath met with acceptance among Men of temper of all Ranks and Denominations, beyond his Expectation, I must declare, as Mr. Hoadly doth, Admon. p. 13. that I never yet knew any single Person, who did not esteem it an unreasonable Performance, naturally tending to revive our Differences, &c. And could he think that all this was to be past by, without saying any thing for our selves, in answer to those reflecting Insinuations? If what he had done, had been put alone by it self in a little or single Pamphlet, it might have been perhaps neglected, and no great notice taken of it. But when it was made a Chapter in the Abridgment of the Life of that great and celebrated Man,

The PREFACE

Man, which now in this lesser bulk was like to come into the hands of all, or most, that had respect to that great Name; How could he think, that we could be contented quietly to lie under these imputations, which were now like to be spread Universally among the People, to infuse into them a very ill Opinion of us and of our practise, if this should be taken for a true representation thereof. And what could we do less, than what we have done and now do, to clear our selves from all that guilt, which we were thus before tacitly, and now by a repeated and open and indeed very passionate charge, loaded with? Sometimes Mr. Calamy hath given occasion to be a little pleasant with him; sometimes to expostulate the case a little more freely. And it may be, the many Irritations, that I have been presented with have been sometimes apt to make a little deeper impression. But I have endeavoured not to retaliate, but to avoid all unnecessary reflexion and to keep close to the Argument; in which our Defence is concerned.

What Satisfaction it will give Mr. Calamy I know not; but yet hope he may have a better Opinion of the terms of Conformity hereby, than he hath had hitherto. And methinks, that both he and the rest of our Dissenting Brethren should wish well to our performance. It being, one would think, most desirable, that what we say should

The PREFACE.

should be true, and that our Representation of the terms of Conformity should be right; tho' it should from thence follow, that a great many good Men in 1662. were mistaken therein (as indeed any good Man may be liable to be); rather than that so great a Number of good and learned Men, from the Reformation downward to this time, should be found to be guilty of the most horrid Crimes, as they must needs be, if Mr. Calamy's Representations be right.

And yet after all, I can have a very tender Respect to the Honour of that great Name, whose Life Mr. Calamy hath abridged, and to a great many others of the non-conforming Way, and even to Mr. Calamy himself, however he is often pleas'd to represent this as an absolute Inconsistency. I know how to consider the difference of Mens Tempers, Educations, and Advantages, their different Lights and Capacities, their different Humours and Interests; and can easily separate their Mistakes and Prejudices from their laudable Excellencies and Vertues; and can have a true Respect for their Piety and Zeal for God and Religion, at the same time, that I think in other respects, they have their Errours and Infirmities as well as other Men, and are not without Blame. And, to conclude, I heartily wish for their sakes, if it would but give them Satisfac-

THE PREFACE.

Satisfaction, the abatement and relaxation of many of those things, which yet I verily believe, we have very clearly defended the lawfulness of. And I wish the same for the honour of the Church it self, which will never lose in its reputation, by Wise and Moderate concessions. And for the more apparent and indisputable justification of all its Offices, for the putting an end to all plausible Objections, and farther Contests and Quarrels about these matters which it were better there were never more occasion for. And this I declare with all integrity possible, both for my self and Brethren, in the name of such as I am engaged with in this undertaking.

5 JY 61

Jo. Ollyffe.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

Reflections on Mr. Calamy's 1st
Part ; and Here page. 1

1. Of his Assaults upon Conformi-
ty, 2
2. Of his Misrepresenting us to the
Non-Conformists, 8
3. Of his Misrepresenting us to the
Church, 18
4. Of his History of High and Low
Church, 21
5. Of Reordination. 29

Reflections on Mr. Calamy's Introduction
to his 2d Part, where 45

Of the Power of the Church to decree
Rites and Ceremonies, 46

The Contents.

<i>Of Submitting to Impositions.</i>	71
<i>Reflections on Mr. Calamy's 2d Part.</i>	90
<i>Of the Rule to Interpret Laws.</i>	92
<i>Of our Subscription.</i>	102
<i>Of the Declaration of Assent and Consent.</i>	103
<i>Of the Passages excepted against in the Liturgy; And</i>	
<i>I. Of the Salvation and Regeneration of Infants Baptized,</i>	129
<i>H. Of Godfathers and Godmothers,</i>	141
<i>III. Of excluding Infants from Baptism, when the Rituals are scrupled,</i>	160
<i>IV. Of the use of the sign of the Cross,</i>	172
<i>V. Of excluding from the Lords Supper, them that scruple Kneeling,</i>	186.
<i>VI. Of the three Orders, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons,</i>	196
<i>VII. Of some passages in the Office of Burial,</i>	203
<i>VIII.</i>	

The Contents.

VIII. *Of the Rule to find out Easter,*

213

IX. *Of the use of Apocryphal Lessons,*

219

X. *Of the old Version of the Psalms,*

232

XI. *Of the damnatory Clauses in the Athanasian Creed,*

237

XII. *Of excluding from the Sacrament those that are not confirmed.*

243

Of the Oath of Canonical obedience.

246

Of the Canons of 1603.

284

Of the Ecclesiastical Courts.

297

A

The Contents.

VIII. Of the Rules to find out Easter,

and the Dominical Letters, 215

IX. Of the use of the Synodical Table, 216

X. Of the old Edition of the Psalms,

1534, 232

XI. Of the Annular Cycle, in the

Aboriginal Canon, 237

XII. Of excluding from the Canon

such Books as are not authorized,

1543

XIII. Of the Old of 1603, 246

Of the Canon of 1603, 284

Of the Ecclesiastical Antiquities, 207

A SECOND
DEFENCE

OF

Ministerial Conformity, &c.

WHEN Mr. Calamy wrote his *first Part* in vindication of the *10th. Chapter* of his *Abridgment*, His aim was to defend the Ordination He had receiv'd; and though He had inserted therein many unkind Expressions concerning us, (who had not written one word against his Ordination) yet we thought it not worth the while to trouble the World with a Reply, while his *Reflections* were personal and reach'd not the Cause we defended; especially when Mr. Hoadly had publickly given him a *serious Admonition*, touching his manner of

B

wri-

writing in this Controversy. But now after near two years consideration, coming out with a *second Part*, He has made it necessary for us to appear again in a just *Defence* of our Practice; and thereby oblig'd us in order to the clearing of our way, to take notice of some passages in his *first Part*, wherein we are concern'd.

I. He seems to take it ill, that ^{Of his Assaults upon} throughout our *Defence*, we charge the *Misrepresentations* of Conformity upon him; whereas He saith, *Mod. Nonconf.* Part I. Page 3. He is not conscious to himself of a *Design* to assault us. He adds, if any man imagines his 10th Chapter of the *Abridgment*, to be a bitter *Invective* against the *Clergy*, full of *Heavy Accusations, Censures and Reproaches*, He disclaims it; that He intended no offence to any; but his real intention was, to give a *Breviate* of the *Plea* of the *Nonconformists*; and that He had only the drudgery, of bringing their *Reasons* into a narrow compass; p. 6. To which we reply, that we do not pretend to judge, his *design* and *intention*; which is known only to himself and to God the searcher of Hearts, to whom we leave it; but that, which we say, is,

1. That

1. That the several parts of his 10th Chapter, according to just and common construction, do imply and suppose such a *bitter Invektive*, and such *heavy Accusations*, &c. For when He saith, the Nonconformists *could not consent to*, and *could not practice*, such things; every Reader must understand him to mean, that they were compell'd so to *consent*, and *practice*, had they stay'd in their places: and by consequence there is a plain insinuation, that they who do conform, *do so*. Now the things which He saith they could not do, and by consequence, chargeth us with doing, are these and such like, *viz.* " The Assenting to a Li-
" turgy, as immediately inspir'd by the Ho-
" ly Ghost in every Tittle; the excluding
" Parents from the Right in devoting their
" Children to God in Baptism; the making
" a new Sacrament of the Covenant of Grace;
" the declaring them that dye impenitently
" in the grossest Sins to be undoubtedly sav'd;
" the equalling Apocryphal Books with the H.
" Scriptures; the damning of thousands of
" good Christians, and among the rest, all the
" Greek Churches; the swearing obedience
" to a multitude of Canons, (many of them
" unknown and obsolete) without any limita-
" tion; the consenting to overthrow the pa-
" storal Power; the submitting to the very
" under-Officers in Ecclesiastical Courts, with-

“ out leaving our selves so much as a Judg.
 “ ment of discretion, &c. The most invidious Adversaries could not well charge us with blacker Crimes. He saith, He is not conscious to himself of a *design to assault* us, but all the World must own, this is an *Assault*, and it concerns us to defend our selves against it. To make this further plain; We say,

2. That Mr. Calamy would certainly judge it an *Assault* upon the *Nonconformists*, if any should act in the same manner as to them. When Mr. *Dorrington* had said that of the *Nonconformists*, which they do not own, (though He and some other prejudic'd persons thought it true) Mr. *Calamy* answers p. 254. *He might as well have said, we have Horns and Hoofs, we reviv'd the Ancient Bacchanalia or were of the Race of the Pygmies — This is so groundless a fiction and so false a Charge, so unbecoming a Christian and a Brother in the Ministry; that you have much to answer for, on this very account. And yet this Charge which Mr. D. brought against the Nonconformists, is not of so horrid a nature, nor can it be more groundless, than is the Charge brought against us. The Ambiguity of the Expression doth but make the Accusation more keen. If He saith, they could not say so and so, or consent to do so and so; He must needs know,*
 the

the people would understand Him, that they were requir'd to do so; and that all that conform do indeed do it: And this is an Answer then, *I had no design to assault you, I intended no offence, &c?* If any should say of some *occasional-Conformists*, We cannot do as they do, because we *dare not consent*, to turn the *Lord's Supper* into a *State-test*, and to come to it, not as an Ordinance of Christ, but as commanded by Act of Parliament; would not this be thought to be an *Assault* upon such Dissenters, and an Insinuation of a *Heavy Charge* upon them, that they did thus? Yes verily; and they would have protested against the Charge brought against them; and would have declar'd, that they do not do so. Should any say, *We cannot be Dissenters*, because we dare not deny the Deity and Worship of Christ, by using the Gesture at the *Lord's Supper*, which the *Socinians* use, who declare that they own Him only to be a meer Creature; The *Nonconformists* would think this an heavy Charge; and we would say in defence of our Brethren, that to our knowledge, they equally own the Deity and Worship of our Lord with our selves; and have a quite different meaning in that Ceremony of sitting at the Lord's Supper, *viz.* to signify Communion at a Feast in a Table-gesture. If any

should say, *We cannot be Dissenters*, because we dare not consent to paganize all the Christians in the Land, not gather'd into Dissenting Congregations; because some Presbyterians have judg'd that to be the consequences of the Independents gathering Churches out of Churches; and because in the *Heads of Agreement of the United Ministers* solemnly assented to, by them about the year 1692. One Article is, "That a visible Professor thus joyn'd to a particular Church, ought to continue stedfastly with the said Church, and not to forsake the Ministry and Ordinances there dispensed, without an orderly seeking a recommendation unto another Church — And yet the *Nonconformists* do continually receive Members from the Parish Churches without such orderly recommendation; No question our Brethren would disclaim the consequence. Upon the whole, we only ask Mr. Calamy, whether He would not judge the insinuations, in such like forms of speech, to be *bitter Invectives* upon the *Nonconformists*; and whether if we should use them, tho' as from others, without disclaiming them, we could come off with saying, *We are not conscious to ourselves of a design to assault them*; we intended not the offence of any, &c.

Besides, Mr. Calamy has not only abridg'd Mr. Baxter's Life, (which was what he undertook) but has amass'd together whatever He found said against Conformity, in the hottest Times and Debates, and under the greatest exasperations; and represented them with all the life and advantage that He could; and given the World reason to believe that He practiseth himself according to these Principles. Is not this sufficient ground to suppose that He has espous'd these Principles, as his own; and to charge on him these Misrepresentations of Conformity, if such they prove? In Mr. Calamy's Book, Conformity is represented with the most terrible Aggravations, as the reason of the Nonconformity of the ejected Ministers, and likewise of his own. And what though He speaks of the Conformists or of some of them; yet if these black Crimes be contain'd in Conformity, they must be imputed to the Conformists, whatever His thoughts be of them. It was therefore necessary to shew, both that there might be other grounds of Nonconformity in those Holy Men; and that these black Crimes are not chargeable on Conformity; which two things are contain'd in our Defence.

*Of his Mis-
representing
us to the
Nonconfor-
mists.*

II. The next thing that we take notice of, is, That He judgeth the account that we give, of the Prejudices of the ejected Ministers and of their Nonconformity, to be inconsistent with the Respect, which we profess to owe and pay to their Persons; as if according to our Representation of things, they must needs be very *silly Persons, mistaken Zealots, that had acted hand over head, without Fear or Wit*; and that they had not *so much, as one Lawyer, or tolerable Grammarian amongst them*. This is set down with a jesting Air, p. 5. to render ridiculous, what He cannot but know, to be a great Truth, That Prejudices from external matters alien from the intrinsic Lawfulness or Unlawfulness of the thing, do strangely sway the Minds of the wisest Men, in their search into any matter, and that very pious and learned Men may be often subject to Mistakes thereby: And if we thought thus of the ejected Ministers, where is the Contradiction in this, to that Respect, which upon higher accounts we profess to have for them? Doth not Mr. Calamy know that Contradictions must be *ad idem*? He owns, that the ejected Ministers differ'd one from another; and the present Dissenters differ from *them* in many things.

things. He saith with some kind of Vehemency, concerning Mr. *Baxter*, whose Name we thought, ought to carry some Authority with his *Abridger*, *A pleasant Phancy!* as if *because a Man is respected, He must be an Oracle.* In all the Differences amongst the Nonconformists, one side must be in the wrong: some ejected Ministers (like the old Nonconformists) thought *constant Lay communion necessary* with the Church of *England*; others thought it not so: others thought it necessary to communicate in the Church of *England*, at least thrice a year, tho' at other times they communicated elsewhere; others were of another mind: some thought Occasional Communion lawful tho' not necessary; others not. One side of these was for many years expos'd to more sufferings, than the other; *they* especially that refus'd the *Oxford-Oath*, than *they* that took it. Must *they* now who pleaded for the Lay-conformity and Occasional Conformity, needs count all the Rest as *silly Persons, acting without Fear or Wit, &c.* And what a strange Phancy is it, to tell us then, *p. 4. that He had thought the silenc'd Ministers had had Common-sense, as well as their Neighbours?* And had not *They* Common-sense too, that differ'd from their Brethren about the Sense of the *Oxford-Oath?* We own'd, that they had not only *Common sense,* but

but (many of them) great Wisdom and Learning; not only Honesty, but great Piety and Holiness; and said no more to their disparagement, than what the late Queen of blessed memory, is reported to have said in the like Case, *That she knew, that they were Men.* We find not that Mr. Calamy is able to gainsay either of these things; that the Ministers (afterwards ejected) did labour (almost unavoidably) under great Prejudices; and also that Prejudices do (almost constantly) sway the Minds of the greatest and wisest Men.

But to make it clear to Him (if possible) that we have said nothing inconsistent, with the professed Honour and Respect We bear to the Persons of the ejected Ministers by these Prejudices Mentioned, We shall shew,

I. That Mr. Calamy has the same Conceptions of many of the Nonconformist Ministers now, that We had of them, and of their being acted by a sort of prejudices too. For having mention'd the two sorts of Conformists that we had said, had been ever since the Reformation, p. 16. He would have the case much chang'd since the time of the *Conforming Puritans*, and adds, *There are many of us, who now separate from the Establish'd Church who should have*

conform'd as far as they did, had we liv'd in their times. It is evident, He means those Conformists, to whom the name of Puritans was given by way of reproach; of which Puritans He saith Part II. p. 123. *They us'd the Cross, the Surplice and Sponsors in Baptism; and kneeling at the Communion, &c. Because they did not look upon them as sinful in themselves, and without them they could have no possibility of Service: such Puritans were most of the Members of the Westminster Assembly, of whom Mr. Baxter saith, Def. of Princ. of Love. Pref. p. 13. I never heard of five Nonconformists among them, besides the five dissenting Brethren; and adds, I knew some that urg'd them to declare their Repentance for their former Conformity, and to have confess'd it to be their sin; but I never heard of any considerable number of them that ever did it, or that chang'd their Minds. Now Mr. Calamy saith, that many of the present Nonconformists (and seems to include himself) would have done the same, and conform'd as far as they did, had they liv'd in their Times: which shews there may be other grounds thought by him and others, sufficient for Nonconformity, distinct from the intrinsic Evil of the Things enjoin'd; which is what we meant by Prejudices. It is evident that Conformity is now the same in all points, (except the Declaration of Assent and Consent) as it was*
in

in the times of the *Conforming Puritans*, save only wherein it is granted to be alter'd for the better; And yet it is plain that if Mr. *Calamy's* Representation of the Terms of Conformity be true, the *Conforming Puritans* must conform to very horrid things, (which yet Mr. *Baxter* says, *they did not declare Repentance for, tho' urg'd to it.*) And Mr. *Calamy* declares, that many *Nonconformists* would have done the same as they did, had they been in their Circumstances. From whence it appears, that it is meer Prejudice that has made Him to represent things as He has done. If He thinks not, we would ask Him, whether these many Persons (and himself amongst the rest) could in any imaginable Circumstances, have excluded Parents from their Right to dedicate their Children to God? Whether they would have made use of a new Sacrament added to Christ's? whether they would have declar'd them that die impenitently in the grossest Sins, to be undoubtedly sav'd? whether they would several times in the year have pronounc'd the *Greek Church* to be damned? whether they would have sworn Obedience to Multitudes of suspected *Canons* without any reserve? whether they would have sworn to obey the Ecclesiastical Courts (in times when they had far greater Power than now they have, and us'd it worse) without leaving

ing to themselves a Judgment of Discretion? Yet if Mr. Calamy, has represented things fairly and impartially (as He would have possessed the Marquis of H. . . that He had done) then did the *Conforming Puritans*, do all this and more; and He declares that *many of the Nonconformists* (had they liv'd when they did) would have done the same. But with what greater evidence must we say, that it appears by what the one did, and the other would have done in like Circumstances, that neither the one nor the other did, or do believe Mr. Calamy's Representations to be *fair and impartial*? And consequently we say, that though Conformity be the same as before; yet, according to Mr. Calamy, there was a difference in the Circumstances of Persons, in the times of the old Puritans, and of the ejected Ministers, on the account of which, the one sort Conform'd and the other refus'd Conformity; and the latter conceived the Prejudices against Conformity, which the former had not. The one liv'd *before* Conformity was thrown down, and the Other after, &c. and what is this but the same, that we had said in our *Defence*, from p. 6. to p. 11. and which He will not allow consistent with our respect to the ejected Ministers? Mr. Calamy himself is so far from thinking, that *Prejudices* of this kind are a sign of silliness, &c. that

14 of Ministerial Conformity.

that He does not stick to own himself to lye under the power of worse Prejudices ; when He avoucheth, *For my part I have that frankness in my Temper, that though I were provided with a Salvo for my Conscience that would bear me out before God, I should yet be uneasy under Ecclesiastical Fetters, if I could not fall in with the prevailing sense of those, who have had the care of its Constitution ever since its Settlement.* This, by the way, we think strange for the Argument of it : We should think, that if the things be lawful (which must be signified by a *Salvo for the Conscience to bear a Man out before God*) we are bound to Obedience by vertue of an expresse Law of God, to submit to our Governors in lawful things ; and what He gives an ugly Name to, *Ecclesiastical Fetters*, is indeed *Christian Obedience* ; and to refuse to do what we lawfully may, because the prevailing Party does not favour us (about which also we shall discourse with Him afterwards) is downright Disobedience.

But what we intend, is a plain Inference from his way of arguing ; that therefore *Prejudices* alien from the Lawfulness or Unlawfulness of Conformity, are sufficient to make him a Nonconformist. He may be satisfy'd with the Lawfulness of all the Terms of Conformity, and yet not be able to conform, because He cannot fall in with the prevailing sense of those

those who have had the care of the Constitution ever since its settlement. We say not, that the ejected Ministers had no other, nor juster Prejudices than this (we have prov'd,) yet (according to Mr. Calamy) if they had had no other Reason than this, this is enough to make them Nonconformists.

1. But we'll not be beholding to Mr. Calamy's saying the same thing, to prove that we have said nothing contradictory to our professed respect to the ejected Ministers; when we shew, that there were many things foreign and extrinsecal to the Lawfulness or Unlawfulness of these things in debate, that help't to determine their Minds for Nonconformity. Our Respect does not only appear in our acknowledging that they had Knowledge a thousand times more valuable in other matters; but that even as to these things, the Reason and so Fault of the Prejudices they labour'd under, is in part by us attributed to others, viz. the Heat, (we had almost said, *Revenge*) of some that sat at the Helm. Throughout the whole of Mr. Baxter's Account of the Savoy affair, He speaks as one that had stood the brunt of an angry Opposition; from Men whose Greatness made them treat Him with Contempt. Their Prejudices are acknowledg'd in some things to be just; that *stumbling-blocks* were

were laid in their ways; and such as they could not get over, &c. Moreover we attribute nothing to them otherwise, than what is allowed to be in the best and wisest of Men; and what they attribute to one another, and to all others. And if it be to call Men *filly* and *without Common-sense*, &c. to say, that they labour under Prejudices, We question whether any Man in the World could be said to be wise. We will set down this in the Words of the ejected Ministers, and leave the Reader to apply them, and then we can trust Him with our Vindication. *Cath. Theol. Lib. 2. p. 174.* Mr. Baxter writes thus: *It is a wonder to see how the same causes variously work on Mens Minds, that are dispositively diversify'd by some preconceiv'd Opinion. You may see two Men learned, sober, pious, in doubt whether the Arminians or Calvinists, the Conformists or Nonconformists, yea, perhaps the Papists or Protestants be in the Right. One is beforehand more inclin'd one way, and the other the other way; yea, perhaps not inclin'd in Will, but have received in Judgment a great apprehension, that some one Principle is right, which more induceth to one side than the other. They both pray, and meditate, and resolve to read and search the Scripture, and controversial Writings with all possible diligence and impar-*

Of Ministerial Conformity. 17

Impartiality; they set upon it, and one seeth, all along as He go's, the fullest evidence, as He thinks, for the one side; and the other seeth all go on the other side, through the difference of receptive Disposition. I have had sufficient notice of two Nonconformist Ministers, that had favour'd in mind the late cause of the Parliament in the civil War; and by the Face of the Dreadfulness and Hainousness of the Guilt, if it should prove that their Cause was bad, were brought to resolve, to do all they could to be resolv'd. They both set themselves to Fast and Pray, they searched the whole Scripture, read over the Statute Book, and all the Common-Law Books, and Cases they could get; and all the History of our Ancient Government, and of our late Transactions: They read what was said on both sides, as one saw all, as clear as the light, go for the King against the Parliament, wondring that any should make a doubt of it: and the other, though still not fully certain, was more confirm'd in his old apprehensions the other way; yet both Learned, able, Judicious, Godly, and truly desirous to know the Truth, and many, and many years beg'd it of God, and unweariedly follow'd on the search; and no carnal interest, I am fully perswaded, made the difference----As far as I could perceive the difference arose from hence: One of them was first deeply possess'd with the sense of God's late

late Judgments Spiritual and Corporal on the religious Party, that adher'd to the Parliament, and thought these Judgments indicated their Sin,----the other lookt all abroad the World to Infidel, Heathen, Mahometan, and Popish Kingdoms, and thought that Tyranny was the great Sin on the Earth which kept out the Gospel, &c.-----and these Preconceptions, and Prepossessions made them have quite different Interpretations of all the Scriptures, the Statutes, the Law books, &c. which they read ----- Thus far that great Man, Writing upon his own Knowledge, and we could not have a more pregnant instance, nor more suited to our purpose.

Of his misrepresenting us to the Church.

III. The next thing that we take notice of, we cannot help thinking to be very disingenuous in Mr. Calamy. As before He attempted to disgrace us to the Nonconformists, as if we had reflected upon them, for *wanting common Sense*, &c. so now He seems to design to expose us to our Brethren in the Church, if not to our Governours therein. He accuseth us of *professing a Compliance with the Impositions, and afterwards to neglect them*, p. 8. That we claim a *Liberty of chusing what Ceremonies, how far, and in what Cases we will use them; and when, and how far, and in what Cases, we'll omit them* p. 9. That we claim such

such a Latitude, that if it be allowed, He doubts we shall be hard put to it, to know when Men are bound and when they are Free, p. 11. He makes himself very merry with our making our selves by our Moderation as obnoxious to a set of Men who ingross the Name of the Church, as the Nonconformists. And that therefore we must expect no Preferments, &c. To which we only say; that as we do not think our selves to deserve any better Preferments than we have, so we are not ambitious Hunters after them; but withal, that there have been all along, are at present, and, we doubt not, will be Men possess'd of some of the highest Preferments in the Church, that have the same Moderation and Temper, and the same Sentiments in these things with our selves; and He is ungrateful, if He do's not acknowledge it. But as to the Matter of his Accusation, He tells us Gravely, p. 9. That our national Constitution which is bottom'd on the Authority of the Church, joyn'd with the Power of the Magistrate, leaves not a Judgment of Discretion, to those who comply with it, be they Clergy, or Laity, in things by Authority already positively determin'd. We think Mr. Calamy is concern'd to take notice of this, as much we are; for He is also of this Nation, under the Power of the Magistrate, and has taken an Oath to the Government. We do

hereby deny his Charge and Accusation: We do not claim a Power to dispense with our selves, but believe that in the things set down in our Defence, the Law has dispensed with us. We shall more fully answer this Charge, when we come to speak of the *Office of private Baptism*, and of the *Canons*; where Mr. Calamy does renew it. We do not think our selves wholly at liberty; we are ready to make good the distinction of a *liberty of Doctrine*, and a *liberty of Practice*, in things indifferent: the one we cannot part with, but must *stand fast in*; the other all Men may and must part with, as occasion serves: But where the Constitution has left us at liberty, as to practice, we think we may fairly take it. We do not neglect the Imposition so far as we think them impos'd: And this liberty is not to be measur'd by the Opinion or Practice of particular Men, present or former, High or Low Church-Men; but by the Constitution it self, as declar'd in the Articles, Liturgy, and Rubricks therein. We shall have frequent occasion hereafter to explain this matter, and something further will appear under the next Head.

IV. We

IV. We are oblig'd to take notice of what it seems Mr. Calamy prepar'd on purpose for us ; His History of High and Low Church ever since the Reformation, from

Of his History of High and Low Church.

p. 17. to p. 32. We have perus'd it, but can difficultly understand for what end He brings it in : Perhaps he might at a venture have transcrib'd any part of his commonplace Book, and presented us therewith to as much purpose. We are left to guess, what service it is intended for, or what illumination He design'd, we should receive thereby. We can imagine only two things that might be in his mind, or that by insinuation He would put into the Heads of others, by this History of High and Low Church.

1. Perhaps He would insinuate, that the Low Church Men, who acted as we plead we may do, have been discountenanced and punish'd by the High Church all along. And if so be that He had prov'd this, it would not have been at all to his purpose, unless He prove that their actings for which they were discountenanc'd were against their Subscriptions and Engagements, and that ours are so now, which only we were concern'd to vindicate. We frequently own,

Def. p. 100, 103, 117. That no Constitution can be so perfect, but that some Conscientious Persons may be expos'd to sufferings, upon some emergencies, under rigorous Administrations. What if some were suspended and otherwise discouraged by some High Men in the Church? Still they thought it necessary to submit to what they thought Lawful, and to defend their so doing, which is all we plead for. Though the truth is, many good Men were sometimes run upon great inconveniences by the indiscreet Zeal of some of their Friends. Dr. John Burgess in his Preface to his *Answer rejoyn'd*, p. 16. thus expresseth himself. *I refused the Surplice, as the Act of my Deprivation shews, but with Protestation that I did not hold it unlawful. I told some of my Parishioners, that I must wear the Surplice or lose my place, and they me; requiring to know, how they would accept my Ministry, if I wore it (for my Judgment they knew) They answer'd that they should never profit by it. Hereupon I resolv'd not to stumble them, admonish't them of their error, told them they would repent it, e're the Tear went about. And indeed so did they with many Tears, wishing that I had rather worn ten Surplices than to have left them.* But it is in vain to return History for History; seeing Mr. Calamy do's not give us one instance of any single Person,

son, that ever was discountenanced or exposed to suffering, in any Case, under the most rigorous Administrations, for omitting any Ceremony or Imposition, in the manner and under the Limitations exprest in our *Defence*. On the contrary, He brings in the most rigorous Bishops declaring, that *they punish't none but for contempt and for evident tokens of it, p. 23. for celebrating divine Service, administering the Sacraments, and executing other Ecclesiastical Functions according to their Phancies, and not according to the form of Law prescrib'd*. Whatever they did, this do's not affect us, who are not for acting according to our own Phancies, but according to the form of Law prescrib'd. If then His design was by this History to insinuate, that we act according to our own Phancies, &c. And that others have been punish't for acting, as we say we may do; and thereby put our Governours in mind to punish us, if we should Baptize a Child privately, whose Father conscientiously scruples the Rituals requir'd in publick; or if we admit a Person to the Lord's Supper, who conscientiously dares not Kneel. If this was the design of these his Historical Insinuations (which we Charitably hope, was not) it was a malicious one. But He has not prov'd that our Governours in the hottest times e-

ver did, much less would now, discountenance any Minister, that should act, as in our *Defence* is prov'd He may.

2. But perhaps by this History He may insinuate, that *the Church* has been all along of another mind, contrary to ours; and that consequently our Sentiments are opposite to *the Constitution*. And it must be said that one party appropriating the Name of *the Church* to themselves, has had this ill effect, amongst many others, that some Dissenters have been ready to catch at it, and to impute any odd Opinion of private Men to *the Church* it self. And when we shew them that the Constitution owns no such thing, in the Articles, Liturgy, &c. They answer, that however it is the *sense of the Church*, meaning one Party in it. Thus Mr. Calamy frequently jests with the *Spirit of the Church*, *the true Sons of the Church*, &c. But if some seem to appropriate to themselves the Name of *Professors*, would it be proper to enter into a serious Debate, whether others *profess* the Christian Faith, as well as they? It would be trifling to prove that the major part of the present Bishops are as truly of, and *for the Church*, as the rest. To come then to Mr. Calamy's History; if his design be thereby to represent the Church

as opposite to our Sentiments, then doth his History contradict his Design. For He pretends to shew all along that there have been Persons in the Church of different Sentiments in these things; and that sometimes one side has prevail'd and sometimes the other. How is the Church opposite to us, when He shews us by his History, that a part of it (reckon'd by him the best too,) has all along been of our mind? Yes, but saith He (and he concludes his History with it) p. 31. *The sense given to things on our side, (i. e. by him in his 10th. Chapter) is the same in which they have been generally understood by those to whom the Care of the Constitution has been intrusted, from its first Foundation.* So before, p. 11. He saith, *'Twas upon Supposition that the Terms of Conformity were understood, as the Generality of the Conformists themselves, as well as the Nonconformists, have all along thought, they ought to be understood, that I us'd the word honest* viz. when He judg'd Dr. F. of *Whit-church* to act more *honestly* in refusing to Baptize a Child privately, &c. Now here lies the depth of his great Reasoning. He thinks we are not at liberty to receive any Child by Baptism, where the Cross or Sureties are scrupled by the Parents; nor any to the Lord's Supper, who scruple Kneeling: This He

He thinks He has prov'd by his History, and by the instance of Dr. F. and that He thereby makes good his Accusation, that Conformity binds us to exclude those that Christ will own; and that the generality of Conformists are of his mind. Let it therefore be first considered, that this is but *one thing*, and in which, we are more confirm'd, that we are in the Right; yet upon this *single* difference that He supposeth between us and Dr. F. with others, He speaks generally, or at least indefinitely, of *the Terms of Conformity*, that the generality of Conformists understand them as He do's; which is a Conclusion beyond the Premises, and such a stretch in arguing, that we wonder how he could make it. He represents Mr. Hoadly also, when it serves his turn, as a very *stiff* Man. He saith of him. *p. 15. He seems as fond of all the Impositions that have occasion'd the Division as those that fix't them.*—By his good will He'd hardly part with a Pin out of the Tabernacle, though Union might be the Consequence. Mr. Hoadly has sufficiently shew'd the World how unjust a Character this is of him: but however it shews Mr. Calamy's Opinion at that time of him, after he had wrote his Vindication of the *Terms of Conformity*; and that He thought him to be a very High Man; and then

then He must be supposed to have given the sense of the Terms of Conformity agreeably to the Sentiments of the High Men he speaks of. And now we do Appeal to Mr. Calamy, and to any Man of Common Sense, whether *the Sense that Mr. Calamy has given* of the Terms of Conformity *be the same* with Mr. Hoadly's; nay, whether they are not contrary in every particular, excepting that of excluding the Scrupulous, as is abovesaid: nay, whether there be not an exact Harmony between Mr. Hoadly's Answer and Ours, in all the material Points about the *Declaration of Assent, and Consent*, and the *Oath of Canonical Obedience*, and the Particulars under them, wherein the main of the Defence is concern'd: and if our Answers are in some little parts *different*, they are not *opposite*. How can He possibly then suppose, as He saith p. 11. *He do's, that the Terms of Conformity are understood by the generality of Conformists* (meaning the High Men, one of whom He represented Mr. Hoadly to be) *as He had understood them*: Aye, but He saith, that at least *the Sense by him given is the same with theirs, who have had the Care of the Constitution all along*. By these we suppose He means the *Bishops*, or else we are at a loss to know what He means. And yet He has not produc't one Bishop or
Divine

Divine owning *his Sense* of things, in any particular, saving that one of *excluding the Scrupulous*, wherein we differ from Dr. F. of *Whitchurch*; Nay, even as to that one and only thing, we shall shew, when we come to it, that He has not prov'd one of the *Bishops* (who *have the care of the Constitution*, as He expresseth it) to have own'd his Sense; and that he is mistaken as to the *Bishops*, that He saith *were upon the Secret*, in the *Savoy-conference*. But after all, supposing he had found out some High Men, yea, even Bishops, to have own'd his sense of things (which He has not) yet let us fairly ask him, whether the *Care of the Constitution* was not as much intrusted with *Grindal* and *Abbot*, as it was with *Whitgift* and *Laud*? Whether it be not as much intrusted with the Bishops now, as it was with them in 1662? Nay, whether Wise and holy Men out of the Government, may not be as able to Judge of the *Constitution* by the Articles, Liturgy, and Laws about them, and of their own Engagements thereunto, as even the Bishops themselves? Supposing that He had made appear by his History that the High Men have most commonly prevail'd, yet seeing He thinks the other party discountenanced by them were as Conscientious and Sagacious as they, why may not they be supposed to understand the Constitution

and

and their Engagements to it, as well as they, who He thinks were the prevailing Number.

V. We come now to the last thing that we have to take notice of in his first part, viz. what He

Of Reordina-
tion.

answers to our *Postscript* about *Reordination*. He is not Satisfy'd with what we have said to prove a *Reordination* Lawful. We therefore repeat it here; Our Defence is no ways concern'd therein. It was only a kind helping hand we offer'd to our Brethren. If they cannot accept of it, we only say, we are sorry for it; and the rather because we fear the difficulty therein will prove a great Obstruction to the Union and Comprehension, which we have declar'd our passionate desire of. That we mist it in 89. He lays often at the door of the prevailing party in the then Convocation. Yet the Historian that writes the Life of *King William* in 3 Vol. saith in Vol. 2. p. 158. *It must be confessed that the Presbyterians did not a little contribute to exasperate the Convocation against them, having at this time given orders to near fifty young Students, and Mr. Baxter the Head of their party having published a Book reflecting on the Church of England.* Being thus perswaded that the great difficulty on the Church side

is

is this matter of Ordination, could we be blam'd if in order to this Union, we us'd what means we thought proper to remove the obstruction? Such a means the proving Reordination lawful, would probably be. And after a perusal of what Mr. Calamy has said to our *Postscript*, we cannot yet but think it possible, that even He may be perswaded to think Reordination Lawful, if He will attentively consider not Mr. Baxter's *Authority* but his *Reasoning*, as he well distinguisheth, p. 51. It is to no purpose for him to prove on the one side that the *Reordination* requir'd is more than a bare *Recognition* of their former Ordination: We acknowledg'd it at first, it is a true and proper Ordination that the Law requires of them. And we cannot but wonder He should say that *Reordination* was not approv'd of, by the *Heads of Agreement* of the *united Ministers*, upon a Minister's Removal to another place, because it is exprest by a *recommending them to the Grace of God*; when that *Head* was design'd for an Agreement with the Congregational Brethren. The known Judgment of many of whom was, that Ordination ought to be repeated upon such a removal; and had He consider'd the Words fully, He could not have made the Gloss He did upon them; which are, *there ought to be a like Solemn re-*

commending him——expressing a parity to his former Ordination. On the other side, it is to no purpose for him to prove to us, that it is not Lawful for them to nullifie their former Ordination by receiving another; which we never said, nor do we think any such thing can be infer'd from what is required. We only argu'd with Mr. Baxter (which also Mr. Calamy owns, p. 51.) *that there may be a Repetition of the bare Words and Ceremonies of Ordination, when some real or supposed integral part was omitted, or is by the Church or Magistrate supposed to be omitted.* Now here is at least a *supposed* integral part omitted, viz. *The imposition of the Hands of a Bishop:* But here is no nulling their past Administrations, no censuring their former Orders as null in themselves, but only as defective according to the Constitution of this national Church.

Mr. Calamy saith p. 44. *He is heartily for a national Church that will leave Ministers and People consider'd separately and in Society, the peaceable Possession of their incontestible Rights: But He cannot suppose that any national Church hath Power to divest the Officers of Christ of that Authority which He hath committed to them.* But is that an *incontestible Right* belonging to all Ministers in a national Church to take upon them to ordain, whom they shall think fit for publick Administration.

ministrations? Suppose the national Church were *Presbyterian* (as it is *Episcopal*) and settled in due form, according to the proper model of that Government; would Mr. Calamy think it unreasonable, that the actual Execution of Ordination should be put into the Hands of some proper Presbyters? And would the Restraint of others from the Execution thereof be an Infringement of their Right? Or rather would not this be absolutely necessary for order sake, and to prevent abuses that would else be run into by weak, passionate or imprudent Men? Would this be *to divest the Officers of Christ of that Authority, that is committed to them?* * Doth

* See Bp. Stilling: *Irenic.*
2d. edit. pag.
197.

not Mr. Calamy know there is a great difference between *Power* and *Right* meerly considered by it self, and the *Execution* of that

Power and Right; or between *Power in actu primo* and *in actu secundo*? Admit there be a Power which belongs *habitually* and *in actu primo* to every Presbyter, to ordain others to sacred Offices; yet sure Mr. Calamy will not deny but that there may be a Limitation of the *Execution* of this Power, to particular Persons, to whom besides the *Power of Order*, the *Power of Jurisdiction* shall be committed; to prevent the mischiefs which would often happen, upon

an indeterminate use of such Power. So that though *quoad Aptitudinem* the Power remain still in every Presbyter, yet *quoad Executionem* it belongs to those, who are by special Commission or Agreement appointed to it: And therefore *Camero de. Eccl. in Mat. 18. 15.* determines, that *Ordinatio non fit à Pastore, quatenus Pastor est, sed quatenus ad tempus singularem Authoritatem habet.* Now if the Execution of this Power may be limited either by the consent of Presbyters themselves, or by such a national Constitution, without an infringement of their Right, then why may not this be done in the Church of *England*? And where is the incongruity committed or wrong done, supposing an equality in Presbyters, and that they have all habitually such a Power, if the Church delegates some, namely the Bishops, to a more peculiar exercise thereof?

And if Mr. *Calamy* thinks that in submitting to *Reordination* He must be bound up to the sense of some more concern'd in the Impositions than we, who seem to judge that the Ordination, which He has already receiv'd, is a nullity; we crave leave to add, that when *some Men* seem to nullifie such Ordinations, *They* may mean no more, than that if any will take upon them such a Power of Jurisdiction which is not by a publick Na-

tional Authority committed to them; and to give such Orders, when there is no necessity; that a national Church may null them, as to the exercise thereof, whether they are absolutely null in themselves or no; or though in themselves, according to Mr. Calamy's Supposition, they may be justify'd by Scripture, *i. e.* are given by such Persons, who *in actu primo* have such a Power to ordain, but are by a *national Constitution* restrain'd from the exercise of that Power, which by the same *Constitution* is lawfully put into the Hands of other Men. If this be not in the Power of a *national Church* to do, they think, it is in vain to hold the Notion of a *national Church*, which yet Mr. Calamy owns Himself to be for (at least in this his first Part); and therefore this is what they insist upon, that the Ordination by such Persons, to whom this Power of Jurisdiction here is not committed, is contrary to lawful Order. They perhaps may wave the Dispute, whether Presbyters in or by themselves have a Power to ordain or no; yea, or hold the affirmative that they have; and yet may judge that they have no right to exercise such a Power in this Church; and therefore that their Ordination is irregular and disorderly, as being done by Persons that have not actual Authority and Jurisdiction for it; in which respect

spect they say, it is null here, as to the use of any Power to be convey'd by it. And if this be the most that can be infer'd from their requiring Reordination by necessary Construction, then may He and others submit thereunto without danger of declaring the Ordinations of other reformed Churches to be null, yea or their own to be so in it self. After all, we must say in this Case, what is largely discours'd of elsewhere, that Subjects are not bound up to the sense of their Governours (much less of particular Men most favouring the Impositions) any further than the Governours declare, and notifie their sense by some publick Act.

As to his Reply to the Scriptures which we brought for *Reordination* in some Cases, and in some Circumstances, we are not so nice, as to distinguish an Authoritative *Mission* or call to the Execution of an Office, and *Ordination*: And if the Apostles had a double *call*, or a double *mission* by Christ; what is this but a repeated *Ordination* or appointment by Him to the exercise of the same Office, for their Corroboration therein, for the further Declaration of that Authority that He had invested them with, and for their greater encouragement in their proceeding in the Execution thereof.

As for St. Paul, He had a publick and

open Appointment and Ordination immediately by Christ Himself to the Apostolical Office. And Mr. Calamy owns *some* to be of Opinion that St. Paul was ordained to this Office again afterwards by *Ananias*, and not only that He was own'd or approv'd in his calling to it. And indeed, what else can be the meaning of what Calvin saith, *Comment. in loc.* that the Apostles made use of this Rite which they took from the Jews, of *laying on of Hands, vel cum gratias Spiritus visibiles conferrent, vel cum aliquem instituerent Ecclesiæ ministrum.* And then adds, that *Ananias* laid his Hands upon *Paul* to this end, *partim ut illum Deo consecret*; (i. e. to be a Minister in his Church, as appears by the foregoing expression) *partim ut impetret illi Spiritus dona*; i. e. for the better qualifying of Him for the discharge of that great Function; As the Bishop now with us, at the laying on of Hands on the ordained Person, adds that precatory Form to the same purpose, *Receive thou the Holy Ghost.* And if this was so, here was a double, open and visible Ordination, one before immediately by Christ, and another by the Hands of *Ananias*. Who, or what He was, is needless for us further to enquire, nor is what Calvin afterwards observes any thing to the matter before us, since it is plain, that here He had an extra-
or-

ordinary Commission from Christ for his so doing. And yet St. Paul afterwards had another Ordination by the Hands of *Lucius* and *Niger* (as He owns, it is the Opinion of many learned Men) by the especial appointment of the Holy Ghost, though He had full Commission at the first for the Execution of his Office in all Places to the *Gentiles*, as well as to the *Jews*. If that was an Ordination by *Ananias*, then here was a double Ordination by the Hands of Men: If not; yet here was a double Call to the Execution of the Apostolical Office, the first immediately by Christ, and the second by the Ministry of Men; and if a double visible call, why not a double Ordination? and then the 2d is a *Reordination*. And as to what St. Paul saith of Himself. *Gal. i. i.* That He was an *Apostle not of Men, nor by Man, but by Jesus Christ*; that may very well be understood of his first original *Mission*, which He had from Christ immediately; or in respect of that special Direction of the *Holy Ghost* in all that was done, either by *Ananias*, or by *Lucius* and *Niger*; nothing being done from first to last *per meros homines*, or *Suapte arbitratu*, by meer Men, or at their pleasure, but by our *Saviour's* own immediate Direction and the profest guidance and instruction of the *Holy Spirit*.

As for St. Barnabas, Mr. Calamy allows, what He cannot deny, that *He was sent by the Church at Jerusalem as far as Antioch*, Acts 11. 22. And it appears what He was sent about, by the design of his sending, and by what he did there, *To exhort and teach the People*, v. 23. which He did in conjunction with St. Paul when He had brought Him with Him from Tarsus. v. 25, 26. And what was this, but a proper Ordination or appointment to the sacred Ministry; which His being *a good Man, and full of the Holy Ghost* did indeed qualifie him for; but this was the first open and Solemn appointment of Him before Men thereunto: And yet afterwards, we find Him ordained by the special Direction of the *Holy Ghost* again at *Antioch*. Acts 13. 1, &c. But, saith Mr. Calamy, we have no evidence that He was at all ordained before at Jerusalem. Now we think we have; for we cannot judge his being sent forth by the Church to preach and to teach the Word of God, to be any other. But when He was sent forth to Antioch, Mr. Calamy saith, He do's not undertake what Peter and John did at Samaria in the very same Case, Acts 8. 15. but Barnabas doth nothing but exhort and preach. And what a wonderful Argument is this, that because He did not

not do, what the greatest Apostles did, therefore He was not ordain'd by the Church to the Ministry? And yet how do's it appear, that He did not do those great things, *viz. give the Holy Ghost, &c.* there? Why because nothing is said of Him *Acts 11.* But only that He did *exhort and teach*, neither is there any thing else said there of *St. Paul* who was with Him. So that for what any thing appears there to the contrary, He did there, as much as *St. Paul* did. But after his Separation to the Ministry at Antioch, *Mr. Calamy* saith, we find Him exercising Jurisdiction too, settling of Churches and ordaining of Elders. *Acts 14. 22, 23.* And from thence *Mr. Calamy* would infer that his first Ordination was there; whereas He only taught before, which he might do, as a Prophet. But *Mr. Calamy* must consider that that is the first time that is mention'd of *St. Paul's* exercising such Jurisdiction also; for they were there together, and did what they did together: And yet *Mr. Calamy* owns that *St. Paul* had his Mission and Call to the Apostleship long before. And we may well think that He exercis'd it, by such Acts of Jurisdiction before; by vertue of his Apostolical Office, in certain places, where he thought fit, though it be not recorded; and so might *St. Barnabas* too, for any thing that appears to the

contrary. But Mr. Calamy saith, *there may be good reason given for such a separation mention'd Acts 13.* And so say we, there may be good reasons given, and we have shewn such reasons for admitting of *Reordination* in certain Cases and Circumstances.

There are divers other things of great weight, as we think, which we said, in this Case which Mr. Calamy hath taken no notice of: And therefore neither shall we. There are two things only yet further, that we shall make some Reflection upon.

1. He saith, that *popish Priests are admitted without any Reordination in the Church of England, when Protestant Ministers are reordain'd.* We hope to set this in some clearer Light, than He has done. It is granted that the Ordination of popish Priests was esteem'd valid formerly, and no nullity in it self, and the first Reformers here, and in the Churches beyond the Seas, were so ordain'd. It is evident also that Presbyterial Ordination was esteem'd valid, and no nullity in the Church of *England.* This is not only prov'd by us *Postscript, p. 139.* But own'd by Mr. Calamy to have been settled by Law, *13. Eliz. Ch. 12.* which Mr. Calamy desires the Restoration of, *Abridgment, p. 655.* Now supposing that

that the late *Act of Uniformity* do's only require a Reordination of such as are ordain'd by Presbyters alone, and saith nothing of popish Ordinations, it is a great strain upon the *Act* to imagine that popish Ordinations are prefer'd before them. The Law has made a *Test* requiring all in Office to abjure *Transubstantiation* and the *Worship of Images*; but none are required to abjure *Mahomet* or the *Alchoran*. The reason is evident at first sight, the Lawmakers did not think *Mahometanism* more tolerable than *Popery*, but they did not think that any would offer themselves to an Office, that was that way inclin'd. Humane Laws are made to obviate some apprehended danger, and not supposed perfect, to prevent all possible mischiefs, which they do apprehend any danger of. This is the Case before us, the Lawmakers at that day intended to Establish the Ordination that is now us'd in *England*, and to require Uniformity therein. There were then about 4000 ordain'd by meer Presbyters (for it seems above 3000 were reordain'd) that were in Livings in this Kingdom; but from that time to this, we know not of three Persons that had been ordain'd by popish Ordination, that have offer'd themselves for Institution to any Living. Though a *popish Priest turning Protestant* (as he expresseth it, p. 46.) needs
appro-

approbation in the Church of England as well as a Protestant Minister; yet what need of making Provision for a thing that was not likely to happen? We think this a fair answer to this prejudice, upon supposition that what He advanceth is true, that popish Priests are not requir'd (upon their Conversion) to be reordained in order to their being admitted into a Living in this Church: This is at most only Casus Omissus, which the Government then, did not think it needful to be concern'd about. But with Submission to Persons better skill'd in the Laws, than our selves, we are apt to think that the Act of Uniformity do's exclude all popish Priests as well as others from Livings till they are reordained. The Words of the Act are, No Person shall be capable to be admitted to any Parsonage, &c. before such time as He shall be ordained Priest, according to the Form and Manner in and by the said Book prescrib'd, unless He have formerly been made Priest by Episcopal Ordination. It is uncertain whether the Word formerly relate to any time before the Person presents Himself for Institution to a Living, or whether it relate to any time before the making that Act: If the latter, all popish Priests ordain'd since the Act of Uniformity are excluded till they are reordain'd: However that be, we may fairly

fairly think that Episcopal Ordination in the latter part of the Clause is the same (in the Intention of the Lawgivers) with the being ordained Priests according to the Form and Manner, in and by the said Book prescrib'd, in the former part; agreeably to the Application of the 36th Article to this present Book of Ordination by an express Provision in this Act. And if this be so, all that have not receiv'd Ordination according to the Form and Manner prescrib'd, are excluded till reordain'd. And to favour this interpretation, we find an instance of one *Anthony Egane*, that preach'd his Recantation Sermon in London, Apr. 6. 1673. who was ordain'd Priest according to the Church of Rome as He saith, p. 6. of his Sermon, yet He writes Himself in his Title Page, *late Confessor General of the Kingdom of Ireland, now a Minister of the Gospel according to the Ordination of the Church of England*, and we know of no instance to the contrary. After all, there is a manifest Reason, why there is no express Provision made for the Reordination of popish Priests by this Act of Parliament; when a former Act had made it High Treason for an English Man to be so ordain'd; and instead of being reordained such a one is by Law to suffer Death,

2. The 2d thing is another prejudice rais'd against our sense of Reordination, from a 2d Edition of Mr. *Humphreys* Book, on that Subject, wherein He expresseth his Sorrow, for having been reordain'd. And He puts in the Contents of his Book these Words, Mr. *Olyffe* set right even by Mr. *Humphrey's*, whom He refers to, p. 47. Now this seems an odd way of dealing with me. I had never appeal'd to the Authority of Mr. *Humphreys* example (for we did not know that Mr. *Humphreys* was reordain'd, till after our Book was publish't) but I refer'd to his Arguments (which Mr. *Stileman* in his *Peace-offering* had also Copy'd out from Him 40 years ago) And had Mr. *Humphreys* recall'd his Arguments in a 2d Impression, I had never been set right by his, p. 47: unless Mr. *Calamy* therein had given us an answer to those Arguments. For as I had not then known, that there was a 2d Edition of Mr. *Humphreys* Book, so I have not seen it yet; nor it seems is there any need of my procuring it. For though Mr. *Humphreys* did express his concern for having been reordain'd, when he receiv'd no benefit thereby, but met with unkind usage from those, from whom He expected another manner of Treatment; yet doth He not deny the Validity of his Arguments, nor consequently of our reasoning agreeably thereunto

thereunto; but do's in p. 129, and 130. (as I find him quoted in Mr. Calamy's Book, p. 48.) own, that what he had written was a *Truth*, and that there was a *grand necessity* upon Him at that season to defend it. I hope, I may more safely write, *Mr. Calamy set right by Mr. Humphreys; yea, by p. 48. of his own Book.*

This is all that we shall concern our selves about, in his first Part.

Mr. Calamy begins his 2d. Part *Reflections on Mr. Calamy's Introduction to his 2d. Part.* with a large *Introduction*, in which He distinguisheth of two sorts of Conformists, p. 9. something like what we had done in *our Defence*, p. 1. viz. of those who had been active in the beginning, or continuing the Impositions complain'd of; and of those who judging them lawful, do comply with them for peace sake, and in obedience to Authority: Of which latter sort we declar'd our selves to be, and as *having no hand in the imposing, nor heart to the continuance* of them, while they prove occasions of so much Heat and Division. We are therefore little concerned in the most of what He saith about the Evil and Mischief of unnecessary Impositions, any further than to vindicate the 20th Article of the Church of *England*, cited several times by

Of the Power
of the
Church to
decree Rites
and Ceremo-
nies.

by him with Reflections upon it, viz. that the Church has power to decree Rites and Ceremonies; and thereby to vindicate our Subscription to it. And here we shall consider distinctly what is meant by Rites and Ceremonies; and how far the Church has power to decree them; and in whom that Power is lodg'd.

1. What is meant by Rites and Ceremonies. Dr. Burges in his accurate Discourse of kneeling at the Lord's Supper, begins with a Definition of a Ceremony. It is an outward Action, purposely done in reference to some other thing, of the substance of which it is no Cause or Part. He shews us, that every Ceremony therefore is a Circumstance, tho' every Circumstance is not a Ceremony. For some Circumstances may be casual, and not purposely done; and other Circumstances may be essential to the Action, and specially make up its Nature. But a Circumstance that is only external to an Action, and purposely done, is a Ceremony. Let us now consider what Mr. Calamy allows, even as much as we desire Him to grant. He saith, p. 6. that Christ has fixt the several parts of his worship, and has not given, as to them, any Mortals a power to add or take away. The
same

same say we. He go's on. But as for Circumstances, He has left them undetermin'd. He has empower'd Officers to minister in holy things---But as for the Method of their management, He hath left it free to be varied, according to Times, Seasons, and Circumstances, agreeably to the general Rules of Scripture: That he hath left many things indifferent, cannot be deny'd. With much more to the same purpose; by which we might hope we should be soon agreed. But when we read on, in p. 8, 77, 85. we find Him distinguishing these external Circumstances from Rites and Ceremonies; and p. 91. would have us prove, that our Saviour has given a Commission to any to fix general Regulations in his Worship, besides necessary, or at most, expedient Circumstances. We do verily believe, that He has not given any such Commission, to appoint any thing but such Circumstances, which He owns p. 6. Christ has left free to be varied agreeably to the general Rules of Scripture; and which they who fix them think to be expedient; and these are they which we call Ceremonies. But He p. 77. would have us heed the difference between Circumstances and Ceremonies. He judgeth Kneeling at the Lord's Supper, and Dipping in Baptism, to be meer Circumstances of Religious Actions: But Godfathers, and the Sign

Sign of the cross, to be pure *Innovations*, and p. 78. plain *Additions* to the Sacrament. Now then, if *Godfathers* and the *Sign of the cross* be only meer *Circumstances* of Actions in general commanded, but as to the manner left free to be varied; then is the Distinction between a *Ceremony* and an *external Circumstance*, frivolous, though He would have us heed it: And He would only have, what He likes call'd *Circumstances*, and what he dislikes call'd *Ceremonies*; when in this case they are the same. The *covenanting* of the Child, its Engagement to be the Lord's according to the Terms of the Covenant, is the *Thing intended*; that this be express'd by the Minister, or by the Party baptiz'd (if capable) or by others in his Name, is a *Circumstance*. So as to the other, The *professing* to own Christ crucified, and *not to be asham'd* of Him, is the *Thing intended*, or generally commanded Duty; the doing this by a proper *Sign*, is the special Determination, or the *Circumstance*. So that his making the *Sign of the cross* an Ordinance by it self, and the special Determination to be of several sorts of Crosses: Whether like a T or X, or Xp. is only a Jest, at best intended to make his Reader laugh, and draw him off from a serious Consideration of the matter. No. The Duty intended

tended is *professing Christ*, whether this should be by Words or Signs, is *left free to be varied according to times*, &c. and this is accordingly fixt upon at this time. Amongst several Scores of such special Determinations made by Men in the Worship of God, under the general Rules of the Word, mention'd and approv'd by Mr. *Baxter*, *Christ. Direct. Tom. 3. Qu. 133.* professing Signs are enumerated. Such *Ceremonies or Circumstances*, the Church in all Ages has judg'd lawful and practis'd. Even when the Ceremonial Law requir'd a multitude of significant Observances deliver'd by *Moses*, who was *faithful in all His House*; it was reckon'd no incroachment upon his Office, to determine many such uncommanded Circumstances; *Pillars of memorial*, and the remarkable *Altar* of the two Tribes and a half, *1 Sam. 7. 12. Josh. 22.* David's *linnen Ephod* (though the Priests Garments were determin'd by God) and the Prophets *Mantles*; the *paschal Cake*, *Cups of Wine*, and the *tricliniary Posture*, all us'd at the Passover; *Washing* at the admitting of Proselytes; *shaking the Lap*, *Neh. 5. 12, 13.* us'd also by the Apostle *Acts 18. 6.* the *Sack-cloth and Ashes*, &c. Our Lord approv'd of several such signs us'd together by the Woman, *Luk. 7.* and seems to reprehend the Omission of them or such like by the Pharisee, *v. 44. Thou gavest*

gavest me no Water for my Feet, but she hath washed my Feet with Tears and wiped them with the Hairs of her Head; thou gavest me no kiss but this Woman since the time that I came in, hath not ceased to kiss my Feet; mine Head with Oyl thou didst not anoint; but this Woman hath anointed my Feet with Ointment. In the Suppl. to Mr. Pool's Annot. on v. 38. Dr. Collins explains these Ceremonies thus. She washed the Feet of Christ with her Tears, this spoke a broken and contrite Heart: wiping them with her Hair; her Hair, with which she had offended through wantonness, plaiting it and adorning her self with the dress of it, to allure her Lovers; she now useth, to testify her abhorrence of her former courses. And kissed his Feet. The Kiss is a Symbol of Love, and not of Love only, but of Subjection and Worship, Ps. 2. 11. by this she both shewed her Love to Christ, and also her Subjection to Him. Anointing with Oyl was a common Compliment: she exceeded the usual kindness; they used to anoint the Head of her Friends, she anoints his Feet, &c. In the Apostles times there were several Observances, Circumstances or Ceremonies us'd in the Worship of God that appear not to have any Divine Command, such as the Feasts of Love us'd with the Lord's Supper; The Kiss of Peace mention'd several times, and call'd a Holy Kiss; The Womens covering their Heads with a Veil

in

in token of Subjection to their Husbands; all which were significant Rites approv'd in the Worship of God, though not commanded by the *Holy Ghost*; for then we should be bound to use them at this day, unless we could shew a Command to repeal them. The like may be said of sundry other Rites and Ceremonies us'd by all of us without dispute or quarrelling; *putting off the Hat in Worship*, though the signification of that Circumstance is quite chang'd from what was in the Apostles days; the *giving a Name at Baptism*, when any one is taken into a new Family, as *Abraham's* name was chang'd at his Circumcision; and the thing signifi'd is exprest by this Ceremony, *Isa. 62. 2. Rev. 2. 17.* And above all, the *laying on the Hand on the Book and kissing it*. There has been great opposition made to this elsewhere. In the *Synod of Gap*, The case was mov'd, whether an Oath might be lawfully taken before a Magistrate by laying the Hands on, and kissing of the Bible. The Assembly judging that Ceremony to be of dangerous consequence, declareth that it ought not to be us'd. *Quick's Synodicon. pt. 1. ch. 6. paragr. 13.* There is a large Discourse against swearing *castis Evangelii* in *Mr. Mather's History of New England. Lib. 7. p. 13.* He saith, those famous Divines, *River, Paræus, and Voetius*

E 2. have

have all of them written against it. Dr. Goodwin and Mr. Nye reckoned it the worst of all the English Ceremonies, &c. and indeed there are these remarkable differences between this Ceremony of *kissing the Book*, and the other of the *Sign of the Cross*, That whereas the *Sign of the Cross* has been only abus'd to *Superstition*, this of *kissing the Book*, has been abus'd to *Idolatry*, in swearing by the Evangelists: Also, that we use not the *Sign of the Cross* in the same place, nor manner as the Papists use it, not before Baptism, but after, and when the Sacrament is before declar'd compleat; but in the other Rite there is no variation: lastly, that though (blessed be God) the wicked abuse of *kissing the Book* is rooted out, yet is there no such express and publick Declaration touching the casting out the abuse of that Rite, as there is in our use of the *Sign of the Cross*. Notwithstanding all this (as was said) this Ceremony is constantly used amongst us all, without Scruple or Quarrel. And Mr. Baxter has amply vindicated this and other like Rites and Ceremonies. *Christ. Direct. Tom. I. p. 349. of the 2d. Edit.* in these Words. *An Action of another part of the Body is no more forbidden to express the Mind by, than the Tongue. God never said you shall no way express your minds in things Civil or Sacred but*
by

by the Tongue; a change of the Countenance, a Frown, or a pleasant Look, *Index animi vultus*. Paul did lift up his hand to the Jews when He would speak for himself. Christ made as if He would have gone further, Luk. 24. Words are not natural signs, but invented and arbitrary in particulars; though the Power of speaking words so invented and learned be natural. If it be Lawful to use significant Words not commanded in Worship, it is Lawful to use significant Actions (under due regulations) therefore all the Antient Churches without one Contradictor, that ever I read of, did use many such. Though Augustin. *Ep. ad Januar.* sadly complaineth that then they were grown to an oppressive number, yet He never speaks against the thing it self. To stand up at the Creed is a significant Expression of Consent, which not only all the Churches else, but the old Nonconformists never scrupled, nor do the present so far as I can learn. Thus far Mr. Baxter; and thus we have a plain account of Rites and Ceremonies, or external Actions purposely done in reference to some other things, of the Substance of which they are no part.

2. We next consider how far this Power of the Church do's reach, which is asserted by the 20th Article, to decree Rites and Ceremonies, i. e. as Mr. Humphreys well paraphraseth

it, *some Rites, not any whatsoever, provided she useth due caution, &c.* (*Two Steps of a Nonconformist Minister, &c.* p. 11.) If Mr. Calamy should ask further, what Ceremonies do you mean, that the Church has Power to decree? We answer by the next Words of the Article, *not any thing contrary to God's word written* for matter or manner, end or use; such only as are for Decency, Order, and Edification, to be us'd under all the Proper and Scriptural Limitations.

But perhaps he will say, that suppose it should be granted that the Church hath *Power to decree Rites and Ceremonies*, or Circumstances of Religious Actions (as before explain'd) in the general, that are *not contrary to God's Word*; yet He cannot allow that these Ceremonies or Circumstances, that are decreed by the Church of *England*, are such as the Church has *Power to decree*; and He may think that they are these that the 20th Article hath a particular eye to. Now it is supposed in this objection that the Ceremonies decreed are lawful in themselves, yet Mr. Calamy will not allow that the Church hath *Power to decree them notwithstanding*: But we will ask Him, why? We suppose He will say, because they are not of the Nature of those Regulations, that are necessary

to be determin'd. Though we may determine those things, which must be determin'd one way or other, or divine Worship cannot be kept up, p. 8. yet these are not (as He thinks) of the nature of those things. And the Power to determine the Circumstances of Worship, doth extend only to those things, the determination of which is ordinarily necessary or expedient, p. 86. As for Time and Place He allows it is necessary, that there should be a Determination of them. For though this or that particular Time and Place is not necessary to be determin'd or decreed for Church Administrations, yet there must be some particular Time and Place fixt, and agreed upon for them.

Now say we, it must be likewise so, in respect to those things about which the present debate is. It is not necessary that the Child should be brought to Baptism, and therein dedicated to God's Service by this or that particular Person or Persons; yet it must be done by some one or other, if it be done at all. So it is a necessary Duty to confess Christ crucified, and to profess our adhering to Him; but this is not necessary to be done by one Form of Words, or by one sort of Sign, though it must be done by some one or other: And the Sign of the Cross made

upon the *Forehead* doth very significantly express the same. But, saith Mr. Calamy, *The Sign of the Cross is not necessary.* True, but some Sign is necessary by which this is to be done, and the doing it by this Sign is no where forbidden, and therefore this Sign may be chosen, as well as any other: and what more convenient and proper time can there be for this Profession, than upon the Occasion, of any one's being by Baptism dedicated to Christ? So again, though, it be not necessary to receive the Lord's Supper in this or that particular Posture, yet Mr. Calamy allows it must be received in some one or other; and what Posture can there be more expressive of that Reverence and Humility, in which this is to be done, than that of *Kneeling*? So also, though this or the other particular Garb or Habit is not necessary for Holy Ministrations, yet some or other there must be, and such a one as should be decent and comely, suitable to the gravity of publick Worship. These are all special Expressions and Circumstances of those Actions, which must be determin'd one way or other, and are suppos'd to be each of them Lawful, because none of them are forbidden, and are only the *Specifications* of particular Forms or Modes not determin'd by

our Lord; and so may one or other of them be chosen and decreed.

But here we expect it will be reply'd that the Case is not the same, with those other things, that Mr. *Calamy* allows. For as to Time and Place, not only some particular *Time* and *Place* is necessary, but the particular *Determination* it self of these is necessary also. Whereas in those other things, though one or other Sign, one or other Posture, or Garb be necessary, or one or other Person there must be, by whom such a thing is to be done; yet the fixing or *Determination* of any of these is not necessary, but they may be still left at liberty, and indifferent, and the Action may be perform'd either one way or the other, without any such *Determination*. This we deny. For before such an Action can be perform'd, there must be a Determination made of these things by *some Body* likewise; and so there is an absolute necessity of the Determination of these, as well as of the other. Private Persons must *determine for themselves* at least, if others do not determine for them. And the things being in themselves Lawful and undetermin'd by Christ (as we now suppose) we can see no Reason, if private Persons may *determine for themselves*, either
one

one way or other, why upon some suppos'd Expedience and Conveniency they may not be determin'd by *Superiours*. And a little expediency or *Conveniency* may serve to determine a Lawful Action one way or other. And an *Uniformity* in these things, though it be not *necessary* (which we do not know, was ever asserted by any body) is yet *comely*, so far as it may be had. And the Comeliness and *Decency* of such Uniformity hath been the great *inducement* to Governours to interest themselves in the promoting thereof. This we acknowledge may be overdone, and may be prest with *Penalties* that may be too severe, yet we think it utterly unreasonable to debar *Superiours* wholly from concerning themselves therein. Nor is there any thing that Mr. Calamy has offer'd that proves the same.

If it be said, that if the Determination of these things had been commonly expedient or decent, our Lord Himself or his Apostles would have determin'd them for us. We answer, there seems to be a very plain account why they did not do it, *viz.* these are not things of that great Weight, that it seemed worth their while, to give particular Regulations about them; but it might be thought sufficient to give the general

neral Rules, and to leave the particular Determinations to the Prudence either of particular Persons, or of their Superiours, as they might think fit to order the same. And the reason hereof may well be conceived to be, that according to particular Emergencies, and Times, and Places, *that* may seem Decent and Expedient in one, which doth not seem so in others. And yet an Uniformity in one or other way may in such particular Times and Places seem Decent and Convenient. And the Judgment and Determination of these things, one would think, should better be left to the prudence of Superiours, generally speaking, than to that of Private Persons: and that the power of Superiours should easily reach, for Publick order sake, to that which every particular Man hath a Power to by Himself.

The transforming of indifferent Opinions into necessary Articles of Faith. i. e. to make indifferent opinions necessary to be believed in order to Salvation; and so to transform indifferent Ceremonies into necessary Rules of Worship, if it be meant thereby, that they are made necessary to the acceptable performance of Divine Worship before God, is indeed a high Invasion of power, and a teaching for

for *Doctrines the Commandments of Men*; which our Saviour has condemn'd, but the determining the Generalities of Time, Place, Posture, Signs and other Circumstances of Actions, for *Decency and Order* sake, that are left undetermin'd by Christ, is quite a different thing, and therefore is not condemn'd thereby.

And yet tho' a *fixt Regulation of indifferent Circumstantials in all the Churches of a Nation*, as far as may be, may be sometimes meet and convenient (we don't say *necessary*) which is as much as need be supposed; yet it doth not follow, that there must be the same Convenience, much less Necessity, for the same *Regulation for all the Churches in the Christian World*; because of the great *variety* of Customs and Manners in the several Nations, which cannot so well be brought to one *uniform Mode*; nor is it needful for the same *uniform Mode* to be observ'd by *different People*, as by those of the same Nation: and for that reason, we may suppose, as was said before, our Saviour did not think fit to determine these things for all: nor hath left such a power with any one on Earth to do it. And therefore *that power*, which is assumed by the *Pope of Rome* to this end, to whom we owe no Subjection and Obedience,

as we do to our own Governours, and who requires obedience to such commands for other Ends and Purposes, than our Superiours do, is justly opposed by us and by all good Protestants.

Now 'tis true, *the worship of God may be performed acceptably, without any determination of indifferent circumstantials*, by our Governours, in some cases; and therefore such a determination of them cannot be necessary: but yet even in such cases it may be *Expedient*, for Order and Decency sake, to prevent Factions and Divisions, that may be apt to arise, by Mens preferring one thing before another, according to their different Humours; and so only are they determin'd with us, and not to make the worship *in it self more acceptable to God, or to conveigh to us the benefits thereby intended*, which, it is well known, is not pretended by this Church.

It is true indeed, that *Determinations of this kind have sometimes created a great many differences in the Church*; that is, they have been the occasion of them, through the weakness and injudiciousness of some, and the prejudices of others, that have not been satisfy'd with them. And for that reason, it would be the prudence of Governours,

to consider well what is fit to be done, and to remove, as much as may be, all unnecessary Bones of Contention; and to Remit such Determinations, as instead of promoting Peace and Order, are apt to give occasion for Quarrels and Discords, as far as this may consist with the Security and Decency of the Publick Worship; and when there is no Detriment like to arise, either to Religion or to the Constitution thereby. And we wish it with all our hearts, for the sake of those that have not a clear perswasion in these things. But yet it is not for Subjects to take upon them the Governours part, or to deny their obedience in such Acts, as they may lawfully do whilst the Command continues.

But that which is most insisted on in this case, is the *Christian Liberty*, which none ought to Invade and Restraine, because then it would be no more *Liberty*; By which, He saith, all Professing Christians have a Right to all Gospel Ordinances, upon the naked Terms on which Christ hath left them to Mankind, in what part of the world soever their Lot is cast; or to have a Right to all divine Institutions without any *Humane Additions*. Now if by *Humane Additions* be meant any other, than the Determining of Circumstantials, that are left undetermin'd by our Lord, it is granted
what

what is here said. But we see no Reason that Governours should by this be precluded or prohibited from the lawful *Determination* of such *Generalities*, that must be determined by some body or other; and when the Determination thereof may be *judg'd* to be *expedient* for the more decent and orderly Administration; tho' such a Determination may *Accidentally* prove, through the weakness of some, or Prejudices of others, an Occasion of *excluding* themselves from such Administrations; which does not arise from any necessity that they should do so; for there can be no necessity, nor to use a lawful thing. Yet we deny not, but when the Inconveniences do exceed the Conveniences of such Circumstantial Determinations, there may be an Abuse of Power in making the same, which it belongs to those to enquire into, that are intrusted with the Exercise of it.

But for Particular Argument in this matter, it is made a Question, How Governours, either in Church or State, come by this Power, thus to regulate and determine things, that our Lord hath left indifferent to be done one way or other, and to lay on private Persons such particular Commands? Now we would only ask again, How they came by their Power to make any Laws, supposing

sing they have such a Power? The same way, that they came by this, which way soever it be, the same way they come by a Power and Right to appoint Rules and Ordinances, to determine things for publick Order sake, in which they are not restrain'd by any Divine or Superiour Law. If there be no Reserve of this Power from them, then they have this by the general Grant of Power. And so if these Vicegerents and Subordinate Governours under Christ are not limited and restrain'd by Him, from such determining the Actions, of those that are committed to their Government, in lawful things, then they have such a Right and Power by vertue of that Government, which they are invested with. If they are limited and restrained in this matter, it ought to be shewn, where this Limitation or Restraint is to be found; for as Mr. Calamy saith, *He that asserts, must prove.* But instead of this, we find they have a Commission, to direct the Actions of those committed to their Care, that they may be best perform'd with *Decency and Order* in the Church: which, though it was given upon a particular occasion is, a *General Rule*. And when our Lord gave his Commission to *teach those things that He had commanded*, it doth no way interfere with or preclude the other. The Com-
mands

mands of our Saviour in many Instances are *Generalities* only ; as that we are to *Worship*, that we are to *Worship with Reverence and Fear*, that we are to *Pray*, that we are to *confess him before Men*, &c. but the particular *Signs*, or *Forms*, or *Modes* in and by which these things, are to be exprest, are not limited or determined by Him. And when any particular Persons do determine *themselves* in these Cases, or *Governours* do direct them, and give them *Rules*, for the use of those particular Signs and Forms, and Modes by which the *Generals* may be best exprest, this is *still a Teaching and Doing what our Saviour commands*: these being but the *particular* ways of expressing what was in *general* Commanded ; and it being absolutely necessary that such general Command must be exprest or observ'd in or by one such Form, and Mode, or other. And it is plain in many Cases, that particular Persons are not so well able to direct themselves in these things, as their *Governours* are. And therefore one would think it might be allowed, that *some* should take upon them to direct and govern in these Cases, and that *others* should submit to be directed and govern'd by them, to promote that Comeliness of Uniformity, which in many things may be had.

3. We are next to enquire more particularly into the *subject of this power*, whatsoever it is, *where and in whom it is lodg'd*. Mr. Calamy lodg'd it in *particular Congregations*. He owns p. 84. *that to give every particular Person a liberty to bring his own Phancy and Humour into the publick Worship would be extreamly ridiculous; and to suppose the necessary Circumstances of Worship not determin'd for each worshipping society, would occasion endless division* — Therefore He thinks. p. 85. *that every company of professing Christians meeting in society for divine worship have a Natural Right to order the Circumstances of their own worship, in a Subserviency to the Common Good, under the Limitations and with the Restrictions laid down in Scripture.* And He instances in determining, *what Ministers shall officiate, when, and where, and for how long time, and in what order, whether they shall sing with reading or without, &c.* Now we would ask Mr. Calamy, whether when such a particular Congregation doth determine some Circumstantials relating to publick Worship, Every individual Person in the Congregation must agree to the same, before He or She is obliged by such an Order; or whether some particular Persons therein must determine the rest; or the Major part must determine

termine the less? if no Determination can be made at all but every individual Person must agree, it is easie to conceive there will be little done in most Congregations, where one or the other through Weakness or Humour, will be ready to differ from, or to oppose any thing of that nature, that may be generally agreed upon. But if some must determine others, or the major part the less (as is the nature of all Regular Societies) where is the Liberty then, that is contended for, of all professing Christians by themselves? If some must be determined by others, is not here an Abridgment of their personal Liberty? And if the lesser Number may in such cases be abridg'd of the exercise of their Liberty by the Determinations of the greater, what Reason is there, why Subjects may not in like manner be determin'd by their Governours? The Abridgement of the Liberty is no more one way, than the other. The greater Number in such a particular Congregation act as Superiours to the lesser by thus determining them; and why may not other Superiours have the same power.

But we shall a little further consider Mr. Calamy's Scheme, and then argue from it. He seems himself sensible. p. 87. that this

is a meer *Independent Scheme*: which name we do not give it, in any Reproach to our Brethren of that Perswasion, but to shew Him how He is professedly gone off from the Principles of the old Nonconformists, both before the Wars and since. Was not this the very thing that the *Dissenting Members* in the *Westminster Assembly* contended for, and which the *Assembly* oppos'd, and the Ministers that afterwards were ejected contended against? And now Mr. *Calamy* is risen up pretending to vindicate the *ejected Ministers*, and with one stroke he has given up their whole Cause, and the Cause of the *Reformed Churches* therewith. For not to mention the *Episcopal Churches*, How earnestly do's the *Church of Scotland* at this day contend for the power of the Church over particular Congregations, obliging them in their Ordination to promise Obedience to Synods, to Provincial and National Assemblies. The once flourishing Churches of *France* (now under dispersion for the Gospel-sake) give us their sense in a *National Assembly*, the 3^d synod of *Charenton*. *Quick's Synod*. vol. 2. p. 467. Upon Report made by certain Deputies of the *Maritime Provinces*, that there do arrive unto them from other Countries some Persons going by the Name of *Independents*, and so called for
that

that they teach, every particular Church should of right be govern'd by its own Laws, without any Dependency or Subordination unto any Person whatsoever in Ecclesiastical Matters, and without being oblig'd to own and acknowledge the Authority of Colloquies or Synods in matters of Discipline and Order, and they settle their Dwellings in this Kingdom; a thing of great and dangerous Consequence, if not in time carefully prevented: This Assembly fearing lest the Contagion of this Poyson should diffuse it self insensibly, and bring in with it a World of Disorder and Confusion upon us — All the Provinces are enjoyn'd that this evil do not get footing in the Churches of this Kingdom, &c. Lastly, in the Heads of Agreement assented to by the united Ministers in the year 1691. the VI. Section is about the Occasional meeting of Ministers (which unusual Term, as we have been told, was made use of, because they had been inform'd, that they might not use the word Synod, it being a Law-term us'd for the Convocation, &c.) The consulting these is said there to be according to the mind of Christ. And it is added, that particular Churches, their respective Elders and Members, ought to have a reverential regard to their judgment so given, and not dissent therefrom without apparent grounds from the word of God;

which is as much as to say, they must submit thereunto in all things Lawful and Honest. Notwithstanding all this, Mr. Calamy places all the power of determining these Circumstances in a particular Congregation or *Worshipping Assembly*. And why may we not be suffer'd to *Argue* from thence thus; How can the publick Authority, or Pastors united together have less power, than the single Pastors and Elders of one Congregation? If one Pastor's determination of these Circumstances (under due regulations) oblige that one *Worshipping Assembly*; then the united Determination of many such by Themselves or Delegates may oblige all the Congregations belonging to them. And if we may believe Mr. *Rbutherford* speaking of this matter in *Scotland*, and the *Westminster-Assembly* in their Reply to the *Dissenting Members*, these *Synodical Determinations* are as much agreeable to the *Fundamental Establishment* in the Church; as *Parliamentary Determinations* are to the *Original Compact* in this Nation. Dr. *Lightfoot*, on Mat. 23. 23. *Ye tyth mint and annice, &c.* saith thus, *This tything of Herbs was only of Ecclesiastical Institution, and yet it hath the authority of our Saviour to confirm it. Ye ought not to have left these things undone; and that partly upon*
the

the account of the Justice of the thing it self; partly, that it was commanded by the Council sitting in Moses Chair.

And if the Church has such a Power, one would think, the Command of the Magistrate added thereunto should not diminish or lessen the Obligation, unless (as the Holy Poet expresseth it) that——Power it self disable. Mr. Calamy allows p. 30. that *the Magistrate may oblige his Subjects ordinarily to attend the Solemn Worship of God in the way they professedly chuse, and against which they do not so much as pretend matter of Conscience.* We suppose He means fairly, in the way that they judge to be Lawful; and we say no more.

We think we have thus fully prov'd the Truth of the 20th Article, which we have Subscrib'd, *that the Church hath Power to decree Rites and Ceremonies, i.e. external Circumstances, according to the general Rules of the Word, and that the Circumstances prescrib'd in the Church of England, are of that sort.* To which He will perhaps say, that yet we have not prov'd the Lawfulness of imposing the things, which we have submitted to in such Circumstances, and under such

Of Submitting to Impositions.

Penalties : Nor are we bound to it by the *Article*. It saith only, the *Church hath Power to decree Rites and Ceremonies*, but saith nothing of the imposing them in all Circumstances under such and such *Penalties*; and it is the *Article* only with which we are now concern'd, and which we undertook to defend. If He saith, that notwithstanding all, the imposers of these things may have gone beyond some of the due Limitations and Restrictions; that they may have impos'd *unseasonably* and too *rigourously*, and upon incongruous *Penalties*: This is indeed what much of his Introduction aims at, and runs out against; but this is not our concern, nor is any way part of this controversie: We are perswaded that nothing in our Conformity obligeth us to determine, whether our Rulers did well or ill, in their imposing these things. But this we insist upon, that supposing the Church to have strained her Power beyond her Bounds; supposing (for argument sake) that our Rulers have err'd in the manner of their imposing these things with such penalties; yet if the things themselves are Lawful we are bound to submit. Seeing we do not so much as pretend Conscience against our way of Worship (as Mr. Calamy words it, p. 30.) the Magistrate may oblige us thereunto.

We

We shall speak only in the Words of the *ejected Ministers* to answer this pretended Vindicator of them. One of the eldest of them yet living. (Two steps of a Nonconformist Minister, &c. p. 11.) speaking of the Cautions the Church should use in decreeing Rites and Ceremonies; names this for one, that *She should not impose them, without need, as Conditions of her Communion* (which is what Mr. Calamy much insists upon) But then He adds against Mr. Calamy's sense, yet if *She do's so and the imposition be unlawful; if those Rites and Ceremonies be not sinful in themselves, We cannot, I apprehend, refuse our Submission for all that, so long as the supreme Power confirms the same.* Mr. Baxter is large in asserting this: *Cure of Church Divisions, Dir. 48. Think more and talk more of your Faults and Failings towards others, especially Princes, Magistrates, and Ministers than of their Faults and Failings against you, Dir. 34. Think not, that is unlawful to be obey'd which is unlawfully commanded.* Much is said there, but far more in his *Christ. Direct. Tom. 3.* where there is a large Discourse about what *Additions or Humane Inventions are unlawful*, in Answer to Qu. 131. Then He shews (perhaps) in more than an Hundred Particulars, what *Additions and Inventions of Men are not forbidden* by the Word in the Worship of God, in answer to Qu. 133.

His

His next Question is, *what are the mischiefs of unlawful Additions, and the following is, what are the mischiefs of Mens error on the other Extream, who pretend that Scripture is a Rule where it is not, and deny the foresaid lawful things on pretence that Scripture is a perfect Rule (say some) for all things?* The 20 Particulars under which Question will much help any Reader in this Controversie. Amongst these useful Determinations his Qu. 132 is, *Is it unlawful to obey in all those Cases where it is unlawful to Command?* In the answer to which He saith, *We shall not be judg'd by those Laws of God, which made the Rulers duty, but by that, which made our own. It is not all one to say, Thou shalt not Command it, and to say, Thou shalt not do it.*

— *A Ruler may have so much Power, as may induce on the Subject an Obligation to obey, and yet not so much as may justifie his Commands before God.* — *The most notable Case in which we must obey, when a Ruler sinfully commandeth, is, when the matter which He commandeth is not such, as is either forbidden of God, or out of the verge of his Place and Calling at all to meddle with and command; nor yet such as is destructive of our Duty to God, but such as in general belongs to his Office to determine of according to God's general Rules, but He misseth it in the manner, and*

go's against those Rules, yet not so far as to destroy the Duty we owe to God, or the end of it. And He instances in the Circumstances of Time, Place, &c. next to be recited, viz. the Hundred Particulars under the next Question. And to Name but one more, Mr. John Oldfield mention'd with deserv'd commendation by Mr. Calamy for that serious Soliloquy before his Ejection. *Abridg.* p. 388. where are these words.—— The plain Question, that lies before thee, O my Soul, (and in the right resolution whereof lies the comfort of suffering, or the duty of continuing at thy work) is, whether the Conditions that are impos'd (without performing which thou must leave thy Place and Employment) be sinful or no? Sinful, I say, not only in the Imposition of them, but in thy Submission to them: This is the Principle upon which these excellent Men went.

It is true, one of them, viz. Mr. Baxter was commission'd by Authority to consult about the imposing, and so he speaks his mind freely, about his actings in the Savoy-conference: But in consulting about submitting to any Impositions, They and we enquire into the lawfulness of the things commanded. So many as judg'd the things unlawful, refus'd them; and they who judg'd them lawful, submitted to them. To say, that it is unlawful for private Persons

sons to submit to do those things, which are lawful in themselves, meerly because they are required by their Superiours, only to maintain their own Christian Liberty, is so wonderful a Doctrine that we could not expect it from Mr. Calamy, who intituleth his Book *A defence of Moderate Nonconformity*. This is the highest Notion, that ever was vented by the most violent High Fliers, that have wrote among the Dissenters, of any Denomination, to say “ *we may do this, and possibly we would do it, if we were not commanded to do it; but now because it is commanded, we are positively determined not to do it, that we may not lose our Liberty.* „ If this Doctrine were universally receiv'd there could be no hope of an Accommodation. For it must be expected, that some things will continue to be enjoyn'd though some Alterations were made, and the disputed Rites should be remov'd, or quite left at liberty. But, we hope, a great many Dissenters are not of this mind, but are greater Lovers of Peace than this Doctrine will allow Men to be, and will give Mr. Calamy but little thanks for venting the same.

There are a great many Absurdities, that must needs follow the maintaining such an extent of Christian Liberty, more than the

of Ministerial Conformity. 77

Patrons of it will be willing to grant, as the Learned Dr. *Whitby* has shewn, *Prot. Recon. pt. 2. ch. 6.* as, that it is unlawful to yield obedience to God's vicegerents in any lawful matter. And if to maintain our Christian Liberty, we must not do what is in it self lawful to be done, only because it is commanded to be done; then by the same Rule we must needs also do what they forbid; because by such prohibition the Liberty of doing such things is in like manner restrain'd. For it is as great a Violation of our Liberty, to have indifferent things forbidden us, as to have them commanded. If then Mr. *Calamy* should think himself oblig'd to refuse Submission to these indifferent things because they are commanded, 'tis but forbidding him to use them, and by his own Principle, He must become an exact Conformist. And it might be in the Power of Governours to cut off all that Liberty which we have of this Nature, and to oblige us not to do, whatever we are left at Liberty by God to do; and thus the maintaining of such a Christian Liberty would meerly destroy it. As for instance, if our Governours command us to meet for publick Worship at such a place or time, we must be bound to do it at another Place and Time. If they command a Minister to consecrate such Bread and Wine,

Wine, He must be bound to consecrate some other Bread and Wine; that He may assert his *Liberty*; if they require the People to stand or sit at the Receiving of the Sacrament, the People must be bound to kneel, or use some other Posture: And thus we must not do, what we have a Liberty to do, only because others Command us to do it; and so we lose the Liberty, we so much contend for. Yea, such an asserting of our Christian Liberty would lay a restraint upon the promises of Men, made by them in the most indifferent things, and they must not do them, because they must be free. These are the necessary, and natural consequences of such Cross-grain'd Doctrine.

And after all *cui bono*? What is the good or advantage of insisting upon such Liberty? As the same learned Man observes, we can receive but little good by such a Liberty from the Commands of our Superiours in indifferent things; because, they being such if we do them, we are not the better, or more acceptable to God; or if we do them not, we are not the worse or less pleasing to Him. And what good do we then receive by such a Freedom? Or what disadvantage by the want of it? It is the great design of the Gospel to make us obedient to the Laws of Christ, to make us Holy, and free from the

the Dominion and Power of Sin. And may we not be therefore certain, that these Actions cannot be prejudicial to any interest or design or Christian Doctrine, whether they be perform'd or omitted, which are neither good nor evil in themselves, neither commanded nor forbidden by Christ: And therefore no way tend to the obstructing our Obedience to Him, or Holiness of Life; or to the depraving our Souls, or bringing them into Bondage to Sin? And is it not absurd to think, that our Lord should purchase for his Church a Liberty to disobey Superiours in matters, wherein obedience to them would bring no disadvantage to them, and disobedience to them would do them no good? Nay our Obedience to our Superiours in such matters doth visibly tend to the promoting Love, Peace, Unity, Humility, Self-denial, orderly walking and such like Christian Vertues; and therefore it is improbable that Christ should have purchas'd our Freedom from it: and when disobedience doth tend to the quite contrary. And for this very reason we may be well assur'd, there is nothing in the Scriptures to countenance such a *Liberty*.

That Command of the Apostle, Gal. 5. 1.
*stand fast in the Liberty wherewith Christ
 hath set you Free, and be not intangled again
 with*

with the Yoke of Bondage, hath reference only to the Yoke of Circumcision and the Judaical Law, urg'd with so much earnestness on the Gentiles by the Judaizing Christians, as necessary to their Justification and Salvation. And that other passage *Col. 2. 20. If ye be dead with Christ from the Rudiments of the world, wherefore as living in the world are ye Subject to ordinances? touch not, tast not, handle not*, hath no relation to things own'd and suppos'd *indifferent* in their own nature; but to the Doctrines and Commands of Judaizers, that prest these things on supposal of the *Intrinsick Holiness* and Goodness thereof as a part of divine *Worship* (and therefore the Apostle calls it *Will-worship*) and for their own sake acceptable to God; which is quite another matter from the Determinations of Superiours, about things own'd to be *Indifferent* in themselves, and made only for Order, Decency, and Uniformity sake in the Church.

Nay, the Scripture it self layeth a restraint upon our Liberty, when the exercise thereof doth any way tend to any evil End. As *Gal. 5. 13. Brethren, you have been called unto liberty; only use not your liberty for an occasion to the flesh; but by love serve one another.* Such an asserting of Liberty then

then, as tends to the Destruction of Love and Unity, and Peace among Men (as the refusing Subjection to Governours in lawful Things plainly doth) is a direct Violation of the Exhortation and Caution of the Apostle. And so, 1. Pet. 2. 16, *As free, but not using your liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, as the Jews did by denying Obedience to their Governours, but as the servants of God:* and then follows his Exhortation thereupon to *Obedience to Kings and Superiours*, as being a matter that their *Christian Liberty*, did no way extend to free them from. And thus Rom. 14. 16. *let not your good be evil spoken of, or blasphem'd by them, who might well be offended at such an use of Christian Liberty.* And 1 Cor. 8. 9. *Take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling-block to the weak, or give occasion to the Fall of others.*

We refer the Reader to Mr. Baxter's 12 Reasons at the end of his five Disputations.

We have only now to consider a double Argument advanc't by Mr. Calamy against submitting to our Governours in lawful things.

1. That our compliance with the things that we think lawful tends to encourage them

in their impositions, and to give such an encouragement as might prove a further temptation, to a further progress in a way of imposition. p. 77. He judgeth this to be a prejudice to a further Reformation, which all ought to desire and aim at in their several places, in a regular and peaceable way. p. 82. But if Mr. Calamy doth at any time joyn in with the Church Worship, according to the Order made, He doth by that once complying shew, that it is lawful to submit to a lawful thing, though impos'd: and then doth He not contradict his own Doctrine, that it is unlawful to submit to such *Imposition*? If it be absolutely unlawful to do it, it is unlawful to do it but once; and if it be not unlawful to do it once, it is not unlawful to do it more than once. By once submitting He allows the lawfulness of *submitting to an Imposition*, to the restraint of *Liberty*; and if it be lawful to comply once, it cannot be unlawful to comply again, *with respect to the Imposition*; for the *Imposition* is the same, and but the same still. But especially his partial compliance with some *Impositions*, and at some times (suppose, *Kneeling* at the Lord's Supper) though He may have very good reason for it, may be taken by the *Independents*, to be a like *Encouragement of the Impositions*. Let him see whether

Dr.

Dr. Owen do's not make a like complaint; in the tenth of his twelve *Arguments* against joyning at any time with the Common prayer, answer'd by Mr. Baxter in his *Catholick Communion*. On the other side, *The Lords*, in the Account of their Proceedings on the late Bill against *Occasional Conformity*, say, p. 18. that *this Practice hath added to the Reputation and Authority of the Church; the Dissenters having determin'd the point against themselves by this Practice. For if they can conform for a Place, much more ought they to do so in compliance with the Law, and for the sake of Unity.* By which it appears, that in the sense of the Independents on one side, and of the Government on the other, the same Objection about encouraging Impositions (if it has any weight) falls on the *Occasional Conformity*, as well as the *Constant*. But if He saith, that He do's by other means declare against the Continuance of the Impositions, &c. so do we. And do's He not often twit and upbraid us, with our *having no will nor heart to the continuance of them, and with doing all we can to remove them?* as p. 352. and elsewhere. Do's He not know that some of the greatest Men in the Church have all along done, what He thinks an Inconsistency in us; viz. *vindicated* the things imposed, i.e. the Lawfulness of them, and of submitting to them

them; and yet written against the expedience of the continuance of them under such penalties? In the hottest times the learned Dr. *Whitby* wrote his *Protestant Reconciler*, in two Parts; The one shewing how unreasonable it is to make things indifferent, the necessary Conditions of Communion. The other answering all the Objections against the Lawfulness of Submission to the Rites and Constitutions of the Church of England. These are the Titles of his two Books. Has it not been by Men of our Principles, that the greatest Overtures have been made for Alterations and a Comprehension thereby? Did they not go far towards it in the *Jerusalem Chamber*, that Mr. *Calamy* saith *Abridg. p. 655.* That the Concessions there made with the allowance in the Point of Orders as is made 13. Eliz. Ch. 12. would in all probability have brought in two thirds of all the Dissenters in England.

We must deal freely with Mr. *Calamy*, We fear his way that He hath taken, tends more to uphold the Impositions, and hindring all Alterations and Amendments. We wish He would tell us, how to answer those Men, who, in our pleading with them for Abate-ments in favour of the Dissenters, speak thus.

“What would you have us do, we are willing to part with Cross and Surplice, which

“ which we value not ; but would you have
 “ us part with the Doctrine, that the Church
 “ *has power to decree Rites and Ceremonies*, un-
 “ der the best Regulations and Limitations ?
 “ Would you have us deny that we have so
 “ much power to determine a Circumstance,
 “ as even a private Congregation has ? So
 saith Dr. *Sh. Disc. of Church Unity* p. 52.
the parting with two or three indifferent
Ceremonies is no great matter ; yet to part with
the lawfulness of indifferent things — is
to corrupt the Gospel, and to enslave the Consci-
ences of Christians ; and this we dare not do.

We think however the Governours may
 secure their Power, and Obedience to it, in
 things judg'd lawful, and yet abate of many
 things for peace sake : But in the mean time
 Mr. Calamy's reasonings may be the greatest
 Stumbling block and Cause of the continu-
 ance of these Impositions and the hindrance
 of all Amendments. But that there may be no
 Equivocation in our owning the *Imposing Pow-*
er, which He speaks of. p. 79. We say with
 Mr. Baxter, in the Place before-cited, We
 do in the general own the Power of our
 Governours, and that the things we submit
 to, *are within the Verge of their place, which*
it belongs to their Office to determine, according
to the Rules of the word ; but if they have err'd
in the Manner or End, and therein go against
 those

those Rules, particularly in unmeet Penalties by which they are inforc't, we are never call'd upon to own that ; nor are we concern'd to give our Judgment about it ; nor Mr. Calamy neither.

2. His other objection is, that if we submit to these Impositions, we know not where we shall stop. *Suppose* (saith He, p. 72.) *I submit to three or four Ceremonies because I cannot prove them in themselves unlawful ; how know I, but I may in time be requir'd to comply with 30 or 40 till the decent Ceremonies that are added, come at last to spoil the Spirituality of my Religion ? What if* (saith He p. 74.) *Ministers were requir'd to preach with a Helmet on, to signifie the spiritual Militia ; to read always with Spectacles to signifie their want of spiritual sight, &c. which Objection also (if it has any force) will conclude against the Ceremonies He complies with, as well as those which He refuseth. He may say, " if I yield to lay my hand on the " Gospel, when I take an Oath, I may be " required to put my hand under my " Thigh, or lay my hand upon the Altar, " or lift it up with my Arm bearing towards " Heaven : All which have their several significations. " If I yield to kiss the Book, " I may be next order'd, to embrace it in*
" my

“ my Arms, and lay it next my Heart;
 “ and so there would be no stop. Nay
 there may be the same danger as to Words :
 for these also, *Mr. Baxter* tells us in the Place
 before cited, are *invented and arbitrary Signs*,
 and that *if it be lawful to use significant Words,*
not commanded, in Worship, it is also lawful
to use significant Signs. Now must we be a-
 fraid of using any Words impos'd upon us
 (suppose in a *Confession of Faith*) though we
 judge them lawful and proper, lest we should
 have ten times as many impos'd upon us,
 and there should be no stop; or more plain-
 ly, because He thinks we may as well ad-
 mit of many uncouth and phanciful Cere-
 monies, whose Signification depends upon a
 new-fangled Invention, as of one or two
 Ceremonies which universal custom has made
 significant; we would ask Him, whether there
 may be the same Reason for using a great
 many new invented Words and Phrases (sup-
 pose in Prayer) never heard of before, as there
 is for using such words as general Custom has
 made significant to express our desires? The
 difference of *Signs Natural and Customary*
 (which long Custom has made significant) from
Signs Arbitrary and Tropological, is at large infi-
 sted on by *Dr. Whitby, Prot. Rec. pt. 2. p. 117.* But
 because this is a very popular Cavil, that if we
 use the Sign of the Cross, we may in time be
 required

required to use Cream, Spittle and other popish Trumperies, we shall give a distinct answer thereunto.

1. That according to the avowed Principles of the *Church of England*, to which we conform, no such things can be required, nor can any danger lye in this matter. For, *first*, the Church has declar'd against all Superstitious Ceremonies, that are so in their nature or use, (unless the Superstition be thorowly cast out) of which *Bp. King* reckons up nine sorts used among the Papists. *Append. to 2d. Adm. p. 268.* which every understanding Christian must and will distinguish from the bare use of significant Signs and Actions, which the Scripture has left us at liberty to use, as well as significant words which we find frequently us'd in Scripture times; and which *Mr. Baxter* saith *all the Antient Churches without one Contradictor, that ever He read of, did use many of.* But not only has this Church declar'd against popish Rites, but also against the Multiplicity of any, *Preface to the Liturgy* paragr. 4. in words full and apt to prevent the Danger that *Mr. Calamy* would insinuate. Indeed, as *Bp. King* observes, *Ibid. p. 273.* *Too many visible Signs are apt to eat out the Heart of Religion, and make it degenerate into shew; and too many words which are audible Signs, are apt to have the same effect, and*
make

make Religion degenerate into Talk. He observes that though excess in gratifying either the Eye or Ear should be avoided, yet that the express Scripture Cautions are against Multiplicity of Words. Eccl. 5. 2. Mat. 6. 7.

Notwithstanding all this, if the Church, contrary to her avowed Principles and Declaration, should exceed this way, and appoint too many visible or audible Signs, or should appoint any Popish or Superstitious ones (that come under the nine heads mention'd by Bp. King) or should require any new fangled ones (as the expression is in the Preface to the Liturgy) new invented, and not understood by the People, &c. In these Cases, we say,

2. By our compliance with these already enjoyn'd, we are no more oblig'd to comply with them, than Mr. Calamy Himself is. We are at full Liberty upon any such Injunction to enquire whether our submission thereunto, be Lawful and Honest, righteous and expedient; and accordingly to receive or refuse them. To this Mr. Calamy saith p. 75. that the Imposers will not own any of their Ceremonies to be vain and senseless. They must determine whether the Ceremonies brought in, be vain or profitable, senseless or reaso-

reasonable, &c. and then He adds, we are wholly at their Mercy. We answer, not at all neither wholly nor in part, for as *they* must determine, whether they are fit to be *impos'd*; so when they have done it, *we* must determine, whether they are fit to be *submitted to*; and so for all his boasted Liberty, we are as free as He, *i. e.* bound only (as Christ has bound Him and us) to our Governours in lawful things.

Reflections on
Mr. Calamy's
2d Part.

Having thus considered what concerns us in his *Introduction* we shall now follow Him in his answer to our Defence against the Charge drawn up against us in his 10th Chapter of the *Abridgment of Mr. Baxter's Life and Times*. Mr. Calamy begins p. 101. with our waving the Consideration, how far any of the ejected Ministers did agree with him in their apprehensions of the terms of Conformity, and whether they did well or ill in the Refusal of them. This He wonders at, and saith, it cannot be wav'd. But Mr. Calamy might consider that we did not propose to our selves the Consideration of the Principles upon which the ejected Ministers went in their Nonconformity, but of the representation that He had made thereof; in which we found a great many insinuations, which bore very hard upon our Practice

Office of Conformity. And it was these only that we undertook to vindicate our selves from, by a fair Examination of what was thus represented to us. Whether Mr. Calamy took these things out of others, or no; whether He quoted Right or Wrong; whether He put them down in other words or his own; whether He barely abridg'd his Authors, or added any thing more, what was all this to us? Here we found such a Representation made; here we found many grievous things said to be imply'd in Conformity. These things He call'd *the Stable Principles of Nonconformity*; and we found Him a Nonconformist, acting, as we suppos'd, upon the same *Stable Principles*. And we found Him the Editor and Promulger of all these things, and what had we else to do, but to consider the Representation thereof as made by Him? And He now owns a *firm adherence to their main Principles*, though He saith, 'tis possible He may in several particulars differ in his Sentiments. We shew'd Mr. Calamy divers *Prejudices* that it is very likely the *ejected Ministers* were much influenced by: These He takes no notice of, nor yet do's He offer to deny; But He saith, that He, and others do act upon the same principles of Conscience on which the *ejected Ministers* did. If they are the same, or whether they

they are so or no, we had no occasion to enquire, or to go any further than to the matter as He had set it forth unto us.

*Of the Rule
to interpret
Laws.*

In his p. 103. He recites the Rule for determining matters of this nature, which we had laid down, in these words. "That it is most reasonable, and the Duty of every Christian, to put the best and most candid Construction, upon the Declarations, Subscriptions and things subscrib'd to, that the words will properly and fairly bear. And that it is a great evil and highly unreasonable, when the words will admit of a double sense, neither of which is by Law or Custom determin'd, for any one to chuse the worst and most exceptionable. „ *This Rule He saith, He is free to admit with these Limitations: provided, 1. that it be granted, that the end of the Law is mainly to be regarded, when we affix a sense to it. And, He saith, He finds Uniformity to be the end of that Law; that there might be one and the same Practice in such indifferent matters, as the Church had thought fit to determine.* We do not only grant him this, but we insist upon it, as well as He, and desire it may be remembred. For Mr. Calamy presently forgets himself, in the very next page, where He saith, *As for the Settlement*

fix't

fixt by the Uniformity Act, it was expressly appointed to root out Discord in Opinion, and establish Agreement in Religion. Here He mistakes that which is the end of the Publication of the Articles, for the end of this Act, which is entituled, *An Act of Uniformity of Publick Prayers, &c.* The end of the Articles is to take away Dissention in Doctrine, but the end of the Act is to regulate our Practice; as He here saith: And this, will help much towards the right Interpretation of our Assent to what is prescrib'd.

His other Limitation is,

2. That the sense of the Legislators be taken in (as far as it can safely be collected) we only explain his Parenthesis, and say (as far as it is declar'd and made known) and then we grant Him that also. It is the declar'd Will of the Legislator that we are to observe, and we must not make our sentiments depend upon GuesSES at, or Collections from the Temper, Spirit, and Design of Men, &c. and thereby (as He insinuates. p. 104.) seek to gain light into things otherwise not visible.

1. Because

1. Because these Gueſſes are Arbitrary and Uncertain, and the Senſe of the Legislators im- poſſible to be known thereby. This we hinted in our *Defence*. p. 18. and Mr. Calamy quoting that Page in his, p. 104. ſaith, that it is aſſerted there, *that the Senſe of the Impoſers is im- poſſible to be known*; and adds by way of Reflection, *This I confeſs is a little hard*. But it is not a *little hard*, but very hard, to have words undeniably true, as laid down by us, to be made ridiculous and worſe by his repeating them, and leaving out what explains them, and makes them ſenſe. For here He quotes by halves: Our Words are, *The Senſe of the Impoſers is im- poſſible to be known, unleſs they declare their ſenſe*——which every Legislator, that expects Obedience to his Laws muſt do. And his Will or *Senſe ſo declar'd*, is the Subject's Rule; not their Gueſſes from his *Temper, Spirit*, or private undeclar'd *Deſigns*: And the Reaſons are plain. Nothing is more eaſily miſtaken than the *Temper* and *Spirit* of Men and their ſecret *Deſigns*; they may be of better *Temper*, than others by Prejudice or Animosity may ſuppoſe them to be; or they may be in a better *Temper* at one time, than at another; they may be better diſpos'd, when by themſelves

enacting of Laws, than when irritated by wrangling Disputes; especially when they are making Laws, that equally respect their Friends, with those that they are suppos'd to bear ill will to. Perhaps further the Providence of God concerning it self in so great an Affair, as the Ministry of a whole Nation for several scores of years afterwards, might well be thought to abate the heat of Mens spirits, and to over-rule their Determinations beyond what the private designs of some might be. Nay lastly, Moderate Men and of a good *Spirit* and *Temper* (even one, or a few of them) may sway by Reason and Scripture a whole debate, though contrary to the Temper of some hot Men concern'd. For these and such like Reasons, we can by no means admit, that *the Sense* of the Legislators should be our Rule any otherwise, than as they declare it, nor must we be left to guess it, or *find light* about it (as He supposeth) *from the Spirit, Temper, and secret Designs of those who have the Ascendant.* Especially considering,

2. That we have said, as He repeats p. 104. (tho' again by halves with an &c. leaving out what should clear up the Sense) that "as to things consulted of by great Bodies of Men, it is to be presum'd, that in
" com-

“ composing and passing Offices, Articles
 “ and Declarations, the several Members
 “ had differing Sentiments, each Man a-
 “ bounding in his own Sense, *if He could*
 “ *fairly reconcile the words thereunto.* This
 He makes to be contrary to the Agreement
 design’d by those Articles and Declarations;
 and *if it stands*, saith He, *We are but where*
we were at first, and we are as far from a
real Agreement as ever. To which we re-
 ply, that Articles and Declarations are in-
 tended indeed for *Agreement*; but in what?
 why in some main things exprest and de-
 clar’d by the Legislators or Framers of
 them; while in the mean time it is intended,
 that the Articles and Declarations should
 comprehend Men of different Sentiments
 in lesser matters; thereby to enlarge the
 Number of them, who agree in the main things
 declar’d to be design’d thereby. Thus in
 the *Heads of Agreement* assented to by Eighty
 Nonconformist Ministers about 13 years
 ago, The Presbyterians and Independents
 had different Sentiments (as we could shew
 in many particulars) about those *Heads*,
 yet agreed to them, as to the main things
 intended to be exprest thereby. Thus the
Doctrinal Articles subscrib’d to by the Non-
 conformists are of great use to keep out
 Socinians, Papists and other Hereticks,
 who

who cannot subscribe them without the most abominable prevarication: And thus they answer their End. *viz.* An Agreement in opinion. i. e. in the main things intended to be agreed unto: Yet do they leave room for Persons of different Sentiments in lesser matters to come in. For instance: The 8th Article effectually keeps out all Anti-trinitarians, Arians, &c. and there is its main use; yet it lets in Mr. Calamy who thinks the Damnatory Sentences to be no part of the *Athanasian Creed*; though the Subscribers thereof have heretofore thought otherwise, and have accordingly vindicated them. So the 6th Article keeps out the Papists, who judge the Writings call'd by Us *Apocryphal* to be *Canonical*, and this is its main use; yet it takes in Mr. Calamy who judgeth it not lawful to read the *Apocryphal Books* in the Churches, though all other Subscribers before Him (for ought we know) judg'd the Reading them there to be approv'd therein. And if the *Articles* will thus include a Man of singular Notions by Himself; much more will they include Persons of different Sentiments in some Points, where there has always been a variety of Apprehension amongst those, who agree in the main and substantial matters intended to be established thereby.

by. So in like manner the *Declaration* of Assent and Consent was intended to exclude such, as thought the use of the Book of Common Prayer, the several Offices, and Rites therein to be unlawful; and so to establish an *Uniformity of Practice* in the main; but not to exclude those, who thought many things might be better exprest, and so could not in the highest manner justify and commend every thing, that they could comply with as lawful; And we have reason to believe that some of the Chief and leading Men differ'd from each other in the fitness of several Expressions, &c. That therefore, *this was the firm persuasion of them that then had the Power, that such Persons who were against the imposing things indifferent and for the bare using them, &c. were better out of the Church than in it* (p. 105.) is apparently false, if spoken universally, and grossly uncharitable; and if it be only meant of some, it confirms what we are speaking of, that they had different sentiments in many things. The design was to have Uniformity in the main, though there might be some disagreement about the meaning of some passages, or expediency of some Rites (which was impossible to be avoided)

*(See his own
Character of

A Bp. Frewin

Bp. Sanderfon

Bp. Gauden

Bp. Lucy

Bp. Nichollson

Bp. Griffith

Bp. Earle

Bp. Pearson.

Abridg. p.

1761

yea though there might be some differences in the Practice; one Church *singing* the Psalms and Hymns, others *reading* them; in one place *all read by the Minister*, in another *Alternately*; in some places many uncommanded Rites us'd, which in others are wholly omitted.

The Summ of what we have said is this; that we are no further bound by the sense of the Imposers, than as that sense is clearly own'd and declar'd by them. And 'tis well for Mr. Calamy that we are not. For having intimated that we all Subscribe the 3d Article of the *Descent into Hell* upon this Supposition: He only answers us, that it bears a good sense, in which He subscribes it. We deny it not; we subscribe it in the same sense, that He do's: But if we must know the sense of the Compilers by *Collection* (as He calls it) or by guess, yea or by the most common use of Words among Men; we have too much reason to fear that they had another sense, from what we quoted out of the *Cambridge Mss.* Yet because there is no authentick Declaration that that ill sense is now intended, and the Words will fairly bear another, neither He nor we reckon our selves bound thereby, yea though Dr. Heylin and some others (especially in former days) have contended for it.

But Mr. Calamy's way of explaining this matter is not at all home, or pertinent to the purpose. He saith, *He that by Hell understands Hades (which is the very word us'd in the Creed) sufficiently acquits Himself.* Acquits himself, of what? Of subscribing the 3d Article? He acquits Himself indeed of subscribing this passage in the *Apostles*, and *Athanasian* Creeds in Greek, which are refer'd to, and subscrib'd in the 8th Article; for there the word is *Hades* in the Greek, and may very properly indeed be interpreted *the State of separated Souls* (as Mr. King hath fully prov'd in his *Critical History of the Apostles Creed*). But here in the 3d Article, it is to the English Expression *Hell* and the Latin *ad inferos* that we subscribe. This, He may say, however hath reference, to the Creed. It hath so. But it is not the Creed that is to explain the 3d Article, but the 3d Article is made to explain that Article in the Creed; and it do's explain it by this term *Hell*; so that one would think, that the *Hades* in the Creed must be understood according to the sense of the *Hell* or *ad inferos* in the 3d Article: Now this, in the *Mss.* Copy of Cambridge, and in the *most common and obvious sense of the Word among the People* (which afterwards in the business of Assent and Consent, He is resolv'd to stick to) is
the

the Hell of the damned. Yet because this word *Hell*, and *ad inferos* as well as *Hades*, will fairly bear the sense that we give it, therefore we subscrib'd it; though it be not the most common or most obvious sense, and perhaps (though we know not certainly) not agreeable to the sense of the first Compilers. And we cannot imagine how Mr. Calamy in his Subscription thereunto can come off from the Rule that we have laid down, as we have laid it. And we would hope therefore, that He will allow us to go by the same Rule, in our way of interpreting it in this Debate, in other things. For the further explanation and confirmation of our way of interpreting Laws, He was desir'd to have recourse to that printed Letter, which was sent Him (and which He once quotes p. 118.) entituled, *A letter to Mr. Ollyffe touching the Declaration*, &c. wherein this matter is fully explain'd out of Mr. Corbet, very far different from Mr. Calamy's loose and conjectural way, and to that we again refer Him. Thus have we once more established our good Rule. As for what He saith about the 8th Article, it shall be consider'd in its proper place.

We come now to the *Affent and Consent*, and *Subscription*, which, as He saith rightly, are a Principal part of this Debate.

Of our Sub-
scription.

As to the latter, viz. the Subscription, He saith, that Mr. Ollyffe p. 20. declares, that He do's not find that this is much contested, and therefore He sets down a History of 150 Years past, in the end of which He saith, p. 114. *I now appeal to Mr. Ollyffe whether this Subscription has been much contested or not.* But why do's He appeal to Mr. Ollyffe, in this Case? Did I say, it hath not, or had not been contested? If the Reader will please to look to our Defence p. 19. we tell Mr. Calamy, as to the Subscription, "that the
 " *Book of Common Prayer containeth nothing*
 " *contrary to the Word of God; it seems rea-*
 " *sonable that we are not to extend the Words*
 " *to particular Propositions in the Book, but to*
 " *the Injunctions therein, viz. that there is no-*
 " *thing requir'd of us to be us'd therein, which*
 " *is contrary to the Word of God, and so the*
 " *next words do expressly explain it, viz.*
 " *that it may lawfully be us'd.* And having given this Exposition, we add, *we do not find that this is much contested.* By which we evidently mean, that though in Mr. Calamy's 10th Chapter, our sense of the Assent and Consent is impugned; yet this our sense (so far as we perceiv'd then) of the Subscription was not contested, viz. that it did not extend to Propositions or Assertions but to

to Injunctions or Prescriptions in the Book. And though We find in this his 2d Book, (that at least in one place) He do's suppose another sense, yet even in this He do's not *contest* the matter with us, or go about to prove our sense not to be genuine and good. And if it could be suppos'd that we had spoken of the *Subscription* it self, that we *find it not much contested*, we could only mean, in his tenth Chapter. We knew as well as He, that it *had been* contested formerly; and do believe as He saith, p. 115. *that if it has not been so much contested of late, 'tis only because the Debate about Assent and Consent hath precluded it. And if Assent and Consent were way'd, Subscription would be as much contested as ever.* So that we cannot imagine of what use, and to what purpose his History here is brought in, as to us, and so we pass it.

And we proceed to the Declaration of Assent and Consent, which Mr. Calamy had represented, as signifying the Highest Justification and Commendation of every Point and Syllable in the Book, as inspired by the Holy Ghost in every Tittle. This Representation we judg'd beyond all measure unjust, and therefore we prov'd that the Declaration meant no more than an Agreement to the use of

Of the Declaration of Assent and Consent.

the Book, and of all and every thing *prescrib'd* therein. In this Mr. *Hoadly* afterwards agreed fully with us, adding more Clearness and Lustre to what we had said. This matter Mr. *Calamy* tells us, p. 116. He will *canvass* with us.

He begins with telling us, that the use of the Book was secur'd before, and own'd by *Subscription*; and if this were all that was meant by this *Declaration*, He thinks it *scarce Supposable* there would be so much stir about it, i. e. He supposeth, they would not have been at the pains to require a *Declaration*, if the same thing had been before secur'd by *Subscription*. Then He phancies an answer for us, which we should never have given, but overlooks the plain account of the matter. The *Common-prayer Book* had then been long disus'd, and many of the People prejudic'd against it. The Governours might think it would revive the Honour of it before the People, to have such a *Declaration* made openly in the Church. The *Subscription* was and is a *private* thing, done perhaps in the Bishops Chamber; and therefore the same thing in substance was order'd to be *declar'd publicly*, and before the People; which we think a very fair Solution of this Difficulty. He adds, that the *Framers of this Act* were *Sagacious enough*

to be aware, that many would understand the words they us'd in this Declaration as looking further, than a bare use of the Forms prescribed. But they were not *Sagacious* enough to tell us so, if they did intend it, nor have left us any certain light to conclude it by. And we must tell Mr. *Calamy* again, that we are not to go by such uncertain guesses in our interpretation of things; nor is it their *Sagacity*, but the Law it self, that is to be our Rule.

But that which He lays most stress upon is in the next Paragraph, *viz.* that there is a Declaration of Lords and Commons against this sense which we have given. Which, if it were true, were a great prejudice to our interpretation, as not suiting with our *Rule* and the *Limitations* which we have granted. But we hope by a large and fair Answer to prove plainly, that what He has alledg'd makes nothing for Him, but rather against the Opposition, that He has made to us. What He saith is this. " That
" a Year after the Act of Uniformity, there
" being a Bill sent up to the *Lords* for the
" Relief of some Persons, who had been disabled by Sickness or otherwise from making the Declaration, the Lords amongst other Amendments order'd a *Proviso*, that
" the Declaration should be understood only as to
" the

“the use of the Book, (twelve Lords protesting against it;) that the Commons dislik’d the Alterations and Amendments of the Lords, that upon a Conference they were dropt and this *Proviso* amongst them. This Account He saith, He has receiv’d and it may be depended upon. He do’s not pretend to have search’d the *Journals of the House*, but do’s honestly give the Story as He receiv’d it; which we will take for granted; and suppose the most, that He might have receiv’d this from some Antient Gentleman, that might have been then a Member of Parliament, and acquainted with the Transaction. We will next suppose the said Gentleman to have spoken the Truth according to the best of his memory in a matter transacted about 40 Years before, only we think we may fairly suppose also, that the Gentleman that gives this account might have a dislike to the proceedings of the Major part of the Commons, and inclin’d to represent the matter as sutable to the design, for which Mr. Calamy quotes it, as He could do with truth.

This being granted us, we say, that the inward sense of one part of the Legislature, viz. the *House of Lords*, in this matter is clearly for us; that the same thing is meant by this Declaration that we say, and no more.

more. To this He saith, p. 119. *The Commons drew over the Lords to their side, and so in effect both Lords and Commons declare that more is required, than an Assent and Consent to the use.* But we judge this an unreasonable consequence. Here was nothing new enacted by which it may appear, that their minds were changed; but a Clause dropt. And nothing is more common in the proceedings of those two Houses (who must both Agree, or the Bill is lost) than for one to leave out what the other dislikes, though still in their own Minds, they approve of what before they had done: nay it is very seldom that in Conferences either House is convinc'd (so as to change their Minds and sense of things) but act in Condescension to each other, as may most suit the publick good. Now it is the *inward Sense* of the *Lords* which we are enquiring into, which is known by what they would have enacted, if the *Commons* had not hindered, which *inward Sense* we have no reason to suppose to have been chang'd by the *Commons* Arguments, though they comply'd with them to drop the Clause. He tells us, that 12 *Lords* protested against it in their own House, who were doubtless able to give as good reasons as the *Commons*: And if they were not convinc't by these 12 *Lords*, we have

have no cause to believe that they were so by the other. Now if this were the *inward Sense* of the *Lords*, We are sure we go not against the Sense of the Lawgivers, for the *Lords* are one essential part of the Legislature.

But if it could be supposed that the *Commons* brought such convincing Arguments, which the 12 *protesting Lords* could not do, that quite turn'd the minds of the House of *Lords*, and chang'd the *inward Sense*, that before they had of this matter; Yet it must be remembred, that the *Law* which enacted this *Declaration*, was made before; and if it appears that this was the *Sense* of the *Lords* when they enacted it, and long after; then a Future change of their mind cannot alter the *Law*, unless they had enacted something new, and had told us, "whereas we were of the Mind formerly, that no more was meant than _____ to the use, now we are of another mind, and do hereby declare that more shall be understood thereby. So that whatever mind the *Commons* were of, we are sure the *Lords* were for our Sense, at least till July 18. 1663. whereas the *Law* that obligeth us was A. 1662.

Come we therefore now to the *Commons*. and here we desire it may be remembred, that there were several *Alterations and Amendments*

ments made by the *Lords* to the Bill, and oppos'd by the *Commons*; of which this Clause was but one, and (it may be, judg'd by them) an inconsiderable part. And 'tis in this thing only, that we question whether the matter be fairly represented, that He saith, *the 12 Lords protested against this Clause* with the censure set down. p. 120. which is ambiguously exprest: whereas we think it highly probable, that they did not protest against *this Clause* by it self, but against the *Alterations and Amendments all together*, or against several of them and this among them. This He owns; as to the *Commons* He saith, they vehemently declar'd against *the Alterations and Amendments*, not one but several; and one of them said, that *what was sent down had neither Justice nor Prudence in it*. Which might be the inward Sense of Him and Others, as to the Amendments and Alterations in the General and Altogether. Whereas as to this particular Clause they might only reject it, as being (in their judgment) *needless*, and declarative only of what they thought already sufficiently declar'd in the Act it self, or for other Reasons unknown to us, which do not reach this Case.

Thus

Thus in the late Bill against *Occasional Conformity*, The *Lords* made many *Amendments*, and *Alterations*; and amongst the rest a Clause mark't C, wherein was this Proviso, that *this Act shall not extend to the University Churches, when Sermons are preach't to the University without the Liturgy*. The *Commons* vehemently declare against the *Amendments* of the *Lords*, and rejected them, and *this Clause* amongst the rest. Many hard things were said against the *Amendments* in the general, beyond what that Member said, that *what was sent down had neither Justice nor Prudence in it*. And yet we find afterwards, that that particular Clause is declared to be only rejected as *needless* because the matter therein contain'd was (as they thought) sufficiently provided for before in another Act. And if He saith, that all this is but supposition; We appeal to all unbiass'd Readers, whether it be not the most reasonable construction that can be put upon this Relation; seeing we have no other way to come to the knowledge of the Matter of Fact, but by the Relation as He is pleas'd to give it us.

But we shall argue with him yet further; If He will suppose that the *Commons* did not reject *this Clause* as *needless*, or a providing for what they thought sufficiently provided

vided for before; but that their *inward Sense* was, different from that of the *Lords*, that more ought to be meant by the Declaration, than — *to the use*; if they gave Reasons accordingly so cogent and strong, that convinc'd the *Lords*, (which their own Members could not do before) and not only caus'd them to drop the Clause, but to change the *inward Sense* that before they had in their own minds of that Declaration (all which must be suppos'd, if his Argument has any strength against us) if we say, all this be suppos'd, Then we ask, How it comes to pass, that these *Strong and Cogent Reasons* were never produc't, and we were never told what they were? Our Sense of the Declaration was publish'd from the very first. *Fulwood* wrote his *Survey of the Grand Case*. A. 1663, And gave the same Sense of it, as we do, and was never Censured for it, when these Cogent Reasons (if such had been) must have been fresh in many Mens minds; and would have been a great Prejudice against all that He wrote. How comes it to pass, that the Gentleman that gave Mr. Calamy this Relation, did not tell him, what the convincing Reasons were? It is true, He do's tell us, that one of the Members said, *what was sent down had neither Justice nor Prudence in it*. But we suppose

suppose Mr. Calamy do's not think, that such a General Charge (if it had related to this Clause) could change the Minds of a whole House of Lords. We will carry this Question further, and unless He can Answer it, it will make all his Argument from this Relation an absurdity. If the Commons had such Reasons themselves, and chang'd the Minds of the whole House of Lords thereby, How comes it to pass that they have made no more Profelytes without doors? Why have none endeavour'd to convince us too, by the Reasons that convinc'd the Lords? If such Reasons there were, could they be stifled within those Walls, and no Man zealous enough for the Church, to write against a Sense, which He would have 12 Lords to protest against as *Destructive to the Church of England*? Why now in 40 years space, have we not one Book from the Hottest Churchmen, to declare against this Sense given, by *Fulwood, Falkner, Sherlock and Stillingfleet*? and to prove that *it is Destructive of the Church of England*? and to produce Reasons, why every one that makes the Declaration ought in the *Highest manner to commend and justifie every Point and Syllable in the Book*? On the contrary Mr. Baxter in his *Unnecessary Separating disown'd* (which is part of his *Catholick Communion*) p. 20. speak

speaking of several Universals, *no Obligation* Assent and Consent to all things, &c. saith. *I never heard a Conformist own his taking these Universals, without Limitation universally, but in a particular Sense.* And yet Mr. Baxter was acquainted with the Leading Men in those days, that are suppos'd to have a hand in the Impositions. Could the *Commons* Reasons convince none of them? Or were the House of Lords the only Ductile Persons that did change their Sense of things (with which ours agree) for Reasons that no body besides (for ought appears to us) was ever convinc'd by?

To this agrees a Question, which we ask'd Mr. Calamy in our *Defence* p. 20. *whether excepting Dr. Swadlin, He ever knew of any one Conformist in England that ever made the Declaration in the Sense He puts upon it?* We acknowledge our excepting Dr. Swadlin was Needless, and may seem Improper. His words being written about six years before the Declaration was requir'd; And after his writing this, The Book suppos'd by him to be dictated *by the Spirit to a tittle*, was altered by Men in several hundreds of Places; so that He must renounce his distracted Rhapsodie, or He could not agree to a Book alter'd so much, from what he suppos'd the Spirit had indited it. But as to our Question, Mr. Calamy pretends

pretends to give us Satisfaction. p. 127. and to tell us of one that did so, viz. Dr. Sherman, whose Recantation He there sets down. We will suppose the Truth of it; though He tells us not where he had the Story, nor where we may enquire further about it. His Pretence is to give us an Instance of one that made the Declaration in the sense which He puts upon it, viz. that had profess'd *the highest Justification and Commendation of every Point and Syllable, &c. in the whole Book, and in every Page and Line of it.* Now that Dr. Sherman had ever done This or any Thing like it, He is as far from proving, as of any Minister, that ever made it. The Dr. saith in his Renunciation, that since the making it, or upon second thoughts He had found some things contain'd and prescrib'd that He could not Assent and Consent unto. He saith indeed He could conform to most of the Rites; but, it seems, not to all. Hereupon he do's like an Honest Man, and renounceth what He had done, as Publickly as He did it. Which shews that when He was satisfi'd of the lawfulness of all contain'd and prescrib'd, He could Assent and Consent to the Use thereof: but He had now found some things contain'd and prescrib'd that He could not Assent and Consent unto. He is then so far become a Nonconformist: and whatever hard words he gives
the

the Declaration in what follows, no more affects the cause than the like words from any other Nonconformist; nor do they at all prove that He was of that mind, when He made the Declaration. Mr. Calamy gives us another Passage from one *Abbot* p. 130. that is indeed Ridiculous enough. Who or What He was, we know not. He might write on purpose, for ought we know, to expose the Common-prayer to contempt: Such designs have been too common. But how Dr. Beveridge's Words prove any thing for his purpose, We cannot see. We suppose Mr. Calamy do's think that there may be *extraordinary Aids and Assistances of the Spirit* afforded to Holy Men in conceived Prayer, especially on very solemn occasions, without imagining their Prayers to be all inspir'd.

But to go a little back, there is one Passage very obliging. p. 126. and if He would have spoken out, might have been a good step towards the ending of this part of the Controversie. He seems willing to suppose it to be an *Hyperbole* in the Gentleman, that He quoted, who saith, *that words could scarce be devised by the Wit of Man more full and more significant, &c.* If by this, &c. He intends to include what follows, *the highest Justification and Commendation of every Point and Syllable, as being in every rittle dictated by the Holy Ghost;*

If, we say, He will suppose these words to be *hyperbolical*, and not to be understood in the Letter : If He will remit his apprehension, *that the Declaration required is as much, as could be desired, or done concerning the Book of God the Bible it self.* If He will allow these things to be flourish and figure, there may be some fair hopes of accommodating this matter, and He shall see how much we will yield to Him under the next Paragraph.

He seems at much pains to prove, p. 121. that the *Act* requires an *Approbation* of the Book, and from this He would argue that the *Use* of it was not only intended. He shews that this word is us'd in the enjoyning the Declaration to Lecturers, and we must grant Him, that *Incumbents of Parishes* are to make it in the same Sense with the *Lecturers*. We therefore freely own an *Approbation of all things contain'd and prescrib'd.* But how? Why, as *lawful*, or *which may lawfully be us'd*, and in order to the *use* thereof; yea, as *expedient* and fit for us to use, in our present Circumstances, and during the present command of Authority, and rather than to endanger the Breach of Peace, Unity and Order. And therefore to represent us, as He do's, p. 122. as *giving Assent and Consent that we may get into the establish'd Church, and yet to remain as dissatisfy'd with some things, as those, who for those things are kept*

of Ministerial Conformity. 117

out of the Church (if He means it of things requir'd to be us'd, so far as they are required to be us'd) is a base and slanderous Reflection, unworthy of a Brother and fellow-Christian. Yet at the same time there is an *Approbation* not meant hereby, and which we are not call'd to give thereunto. Mr. Calamy saith, p. 122. *The old Puritans us'd the Common prayer, but they would never have declar'd their approbation of the strict imposition of it.* But what is this to the purpose? They declar'd their *Approbation* of it for use, by their very use of it. The *strict Imposition* of it is another thing, and is brought in here by Head and Shoulders; 'tis the *Approbation* and *Use* of it now that we are upon, and not the *Imposition*; we have nothing to do with that. Nor do we declare our *Approbation* of it as the best, and most perfect, and capable of no Amendments. It is well known that many that *approve* of the Book as it is, in the sense by us given, do yet earnestly desire some Amendments for the further perfecting and compleating of it. So that the *Approbation* requir'd doth not in the least confront the sense of the Assent and Consent given by us, which we are directed to, by the Title of the Act, the end for which it is design'd, the Preface to the Declaration, and the express mention made of the

Use of the Book several times in the Body of the *Act*, which is enough to determine the sense of the *Approbation* mention'd in those two places in it. But, saith He, *the Approbation of a Book seems to be more than a bare use of it.* 'Tis true, *Approbation* is not *Use*; they are two distinct Notions. But *Approbation* is in order to *Use*; and so we find it here determined, and there is not the least ground to collect or infer any other *Approbation* from any part or passages in the whole *Act*. Thus we have reply'd to what is urg'd by Him a-new in this matter.

Next He reflects upon the *Unfeigned* Assent and Consent, that is required, which we had given some account of. 'Tis this word *Unfeigned* troubles him, as, it seems it has done others. It is this deadly Syllable *Un*, which, He saith, has made some Nonconformists, which else they would not have been. We wonder at it. We cannot perceive for our parts, but that it is as harmless a Syllable in this matter, as any of the rest. When we make such a Solemn Declaration, we verily think it ought to be *unfeigned*, whether the word were put in or no, or else we ought not to do it at all. But we know it is common in *Acts* and *Declarations* to add words, which are not absolutely necessary for the more express signification

nification of the matter intended; and we believe that it signifies here no more, but only that we do *really* and *verily* consent and agree to the *Use* of the Book according to order.

But, saith Mr. Calamy, *Unfeigned* must have respect to the *Approbation*, and not only to the *Use*. Suppose this be allow'd Him; yet when the *Approbation* is determined to the *Use* (as we have argued before) then the *unfeigned* Approbation is in order to the *Use*. An *unfeigned* Approbation alone by it self, is not so much as an *Assent* and *Consent* to the *Use*; for a Man may *unfeignedly* approve a thing to be lawful, and not contrary to the word of God, when yet He may not consent to the use of it. And therefore in order to an *Uniformity* in *publick Worship*, it was plainly the design of our Governours to engage us to an *unfeigned* Assent and Consent to the *Use* of the Book, and not to the *Approbation* only. The *Approbation* is too little without the *Use*, but it is to be so approved as to be used. And the *unfeigned* Consent to the *Use* is the great thing to the end design'd, which is an *Uniformity* in publick Worship.

But, saith Mr. Calamy, He should never give his *unfeigned* Assent and Consent in the *Worship* of God, to what He had no Heart

nor Will to the continuance of. And He supposeth me to be of that Mind. *Nor should He have any Heart,* He saith, *to encourage or press others,* as He supposeth I have done, *to an unfeigned Agreement to such things,* as He had himself after such a Declaration, done all He could to remove. By which Expression He means to insinuate that this is my Case. Mr. Calamy is very free and frequent in such Reflections as these, though to no purpose to the matter in Hand, and which really shew, neither his Charity nor Judgment. Sir, I do *unfeignedly* believe the Rites and Ceremonies, as they are enjoyn'd, to be in themselves Lawful; and Expedient too to be us'd in our present Circumstances, being commanded by Authority, and so long as they are so, and for Peace and Union sake: And therefore I have declar'd, not a *feigned*, but an *unfeigned* Assent and Consent to the Use of them; and wish you and others could do the same, in the present Circumstances, for the same ends, and reasons, that I have done. And if I have had for all that, *no Heart nor Will to the continuance of them,* it is because, though I have thought them *Lawful*, I do not think them *Necessary*; and am of Opinion, if it might please our Superiours, that they might well be spared without any detriment

ment to Religion, or the publick Worship, and for the same Peace and Union sake; they having been the occasion of so much Contention and Quarrel amongst us. It is for your sake and the sake of your Brethren, many Learned and good Men, that I and others wish they were removed or relaxed, when Authority shall please to order it; though in the mean time we use them our selves and wish that others could do so for the ends aforesaid. And is this all the Return I have for my kindness and good will to you? 'Pray, Sir, where is the inconsistency of these things as I have truly stated the matter? And now to go on.

The next thing He insists on, is the difference between *Assent* and *Consent* in the Common an Usual Sense of these words. We told Mr. Calamy in our *Defence*, and prov'd it too, that *Assent* and *Consent* are Law-terms, and are both of them words of the same Import in *Acts of Parliament*. And this He allows, and yet He will take them according to their *common Import*, and so He saith, *He is sure they are different*. He would not do thus in the 3^d Article of our Saviour's Descent into *Hell*, because there it was cross to his Purpose: the usual import of that word (even in the Sense of the Common People, which is not the Case

Case here) being quite different from that Sense in which He subscribed it. But here now, there is another turn to be serv'd: And He will needs take these words according to their usual and common Import, in this Act, which is a Law; though he is convinc'd that our Laws use the Words promiscuously to mean the same Thing. Whereas in interpreting the Sense of Words used by any Author, where they are doubtful, the Rule always is, to consider in what Sense they are us'd by the same Author in other places; and accordingly to interpret them; if the Sense will bear it, or there be just Reason to incline to the taking of them in the same Signification. Now here we have to do, not with a *Philosophick* Discourse, but with a Law compos'd by Lawyers, as hath been said; who do not always make use of a *Philosophick* Niceness or Accuracy in their Terms, but do commonly use a great many words something differing in their most proper Signification, to express the same thing. And thus we have found that they have us'd these very words indifferently, about which the Contest is: And withal that the Act itself hath determin'd the Meaning, and requir'd in the Preface to the Declaration, that Assent and Consent both are to be given to the

the Use of all things in the said Book. And if a Minister will mean otherwise when He makes the Declaration, it is more than the Act intends or obligeth Him to; nor do's it answer the End or Design of the Imposition of the Liturgy (which Mr. Calamy own'd to be the Rule by which we are to proceed in our Understanding of things) which is plainly Intended and Declared to be a *Form* of Publick Prayers, Administration of Sacraments, and Ordination of Officers in the Church; and to direct the Ministers in the Use of such decent Postures and Gestures, and other Rites, as may render the Performance of all their Ministrations in the Church more Solemn and Grave; and that there may be an *Uniformity* in divine Worship. And if a Minister then declares his *Assent and Consent* to the Use of all this, He therein fully answers the end of the Imposition intended by the Act.

He further observes, that this Assent and Consent must be to *all and every thing Contain'd and Prescrib'd*, i. e. say we, *so Contain'd as to be Prescrib'd*, no, saith He, but to the *Whole and Each part*; all that is *contain'd*, and not only all that is *prescrib'd*: and that *Assent* is to be given to one thing and *Consent* to another (though the *Act* determines both words to *One* and the same thing just before

before the *Declaration*) This Matter is fully clear'd up, besides what we had in our Defence, in the Printed *Letter* mention'd before, which Mr. Calamy (for certain Reasons, no doubt) hath taken no notice of.

That Letter considers the *Declaration* it self, and the *End* and Design thereof. It begins with the latter first (which we have already spoken to) It is an Axiom in Logick, *Finis dat Modum & Mensuram medietatis*. To stretch and enlarge the Means further than is necessary or proper for the Attainment of the design'd End, is weak and absurd. There we find quoted Bp. Stillingfleet's Words, in his *Sermon of Separation* p. 49. *It is a hard Case with a Church when Men shall set their Wits to strain every thing to the worst Sense; to stretch Laws beyond the Intent and Design of them, to gather together all the doubtful and obscure Passages, &c. and will not distinguish between the Approbation of the Use, and of the Choice of things; for upon such terms as these, Men think to justify the present Divisions. I much question whether if they proceed in such a manner, they can hold Communion with any Church in the Christian World.* Which words are only mention'd to shew how clear that Great Man thought our Sense of the Declaration to be. Nor is there any just Reason to conceive (as it follows

follows there) that the End or Design of the Lawgivers could possibly be, that a Minister should hereby *testify his highest Justification and Commendation of every Point and Syllable, &c. in the whole Book and every Page and Line in it*; which is more than can be done to any Translation of the Bible it self; and when at the same time they expect, that such just and favourable Constructions should be allow'd to it, as in common Equity ought to be allowed to all Humane Writings. Nor can we conceive, that they should require such *highest Justification and Commendation, &c.* to be declar'd, in all times to come, when they in the same Book profess, that *the particular Forms of Divine Worship, and the Rites and Ceremonies appointed to be used therein, being things in their own nature Indifferent, and Alterable, and so acknowledg'd; it is but reasonable, that upon Weighty and Important Considerations, according to the various Exigency of Times and Occasions, such Changes and Alterations should be made therein, as to those that are in Authority should from time to time seem either Necessary or Expedient.* For supposing that some Persons might in the *Highest* manner justify and commend every Line and Syllable at one time; yet when at another time, Alterations become necessary or expedient (as in the Judgment of the Lawgivers they may do) How could a
De-

Declaration with such a meaning be enjoin'd or taken by those very Persons, or any of the like Sentiments with them, who were presum'd at first to testify their highest justification, &c.

After this the aforesaid Letter go's on to shew from the *very Words* of the Declaration *in themselves*, that they must be understood in our Sense and no other. For it is a Maxim in Law (and the constant Usage and Construction of words agreeth with it) *In toto jure, generi per speciem derogatur*. Now the Assent and Consent is to All and every thing contain'd and prescrib'd in the Book, &c. i. e. that are so contain'd, as to be also prescrib'd. For the things contain'd in the Book are of two kinds or species, *viz. Propositions* and *Prescriptions*. Now the common Usage is, that when any thing is spoken or exprest first in the *General*, and then afterwards a *Specification* is added, or a *Special* Expression is subjoyn'd to the *General*, and comprehended under it; that then the *Genus* or general Expression is limited by that *Species*, and ought to be intended no further. *Species semper generi solet derogare, quotiescunque speciei & generis separatim fit mentio. Vid. Bronchorst. in tit. de Regulis juris ad L. 80.* As if a Book should be partly in Manuscript and partly

Printed.

Printed, and one should say, I Assent and Consent to all and every thing *Contain'd* and *Printed* in this Book. Would any think that He thereby Assented to the Manuscript part? If as to a Printed Book, He saith, I do Renounce and Abhor all and every thing *contain'd* herein, and *Printed in an Italick Character*. The Renunciation is limited to those things that are Printed in that Character, and is not to extend to all that is contain'd indifferently, and not so printed. In these and in an Hundred other Instances (of which this in the Declaration is one) there can be no probable Reason given, why the *Species* should be subjoyn'd, but to Limit and Derogate from the *Genus*. More is set down there to Illustrate this Matter, but this is sufficient to be transcrib'd.

But here Mr. Calamy argues from the *Subscription*, to the *Declaration*. There is a difference between *contain'd* and *prescrib'd*, He saith, in the *Subscription*, and therefore, He thinks, it is reasonable, that it should be the same in the *Declaration*; That it would be something strange, if the verbal *Declaration* should not amount to as full an *Approbation*, as the *Subscription*. But we Answer that it is not Necessary so to understand the *Subscription*; but, as we have said, when we subscribe

subscribe, that the *Book of Common prayer* contains in it nothing contrary to the word of God, and that it may lawfully be us'd; The former Expression may rightly be understood in order to the Latter; that it contains no Prescription therein contrary to the Word of God, and therefore may be used. So that the *containing* here is exprest for the sake of the Use and in Order to it. And we verily think that Mr. Calamy's Argument ought to be inverted, and will rather turn against him; and that the *Subscription* is to be Interpreted by the *Declaration*, and not the *Declaration* by the *Subscription*. For the *Declaration* is the last Act, and is plainly intended for the fullest Settlement of Conformity, that the State thought fit; and in all Reason, the first is to be Interpreted by the last, and not the last by first. And we are abundantly convinc'd, and we believe have sufficiently prov'd, that the *Declaration* hath only regard to the *Use* of the Book, and for this very Reason (quite contrary to Mr. Calamy's Argument) we infer that the *Subscription* hath only reference to the same. And thus we have considered all that He hath urg'd concerning this matter.

As for what he adds p. 126. that *He do's not see, that either Mr. Ollyffe or Mr. Hoadly have any such cause of triumphing over the ejected Ministers upon this Head, as they seem to imagin.* I must tell Him for my self, and I doubt not but I may for Mr. Hoadly also, that we had no such thing in our heads. We have nothing to do with the ejected Ministers in this Matter. We have only to do with the Representation of Conformity which He has given us; and to Vindicate our selves from the Imputations that are contain'd therein; and to assist others, that are willing to accept thereof, in the right understanding of things, as they seem to us. Our end is self-defence, and to clear up these matters, in which we are concern'd, to others also, that they may be satisfy'd as well as we, in that which is our practice. But we have no design to triumph over Him or any body else; We would chuse rather to leave that Province to Himself, tho' we verily think, He will have no occasion for it.

We come now to the Passages excepted against in the Liturgy.

1. He begins with the *Rubrick about the Salvation of Infants,* and their Regeneration mention'd

Of the Salvation and the Regeneration of Infants.

in the *Office of Baptism*. As to the first, we have fully prov'd that the *Assent and Consent* hath no Relation to such Assertions; yet we gave Him a fair Sense of it, which He do's not go about to answer, But saith, p. 135. that *Mr. Ollyffe is angry, chafes at a Mighty rate, pelts about Axioms*. Whether there be any Reason for these words from our *Defence*, I leave the Reader to judge. He adds, *If He will understand only some Children, as meant by that Rubrick, I cannot help it*. Whereas I must understand it so, and it is plain He do's not urge against us so much as a shew of an Argument to the contrary. It is true afterwards p. 141. in an Answer to Mr. *Hoadly*, He quotes a Passage from Mr. *Baxter* to prove that the Rubrick must extend to *all Children*: because Bp. *Gunning* who brought it in, exprest his Sense to be for all such Infants being sav'd. How many were of an other opinion is not said. But what Mr. *Baxter* meant by bringing it in, He best knew. For certain it is, it was in the Liturgy before Bp. *Gunning* was born, with the explication of it according to what we had set down in our *Defence*, p. 28. viz. just before the Catechism, in these words. *It is certain by God's word that Children being Baptiz'd, have all things necessary to their Salvation, and be undoubtedly Saved*. There is not
the

the least shew of Reason to suppose, that the Church should mean, that *All* Infants, who are Baptiz'd dying before they commit actual Sin, are saved, whether they had a Right to Baptism or no, when they were Baptiz'd. But it must certainly be meant of those only that *have a Right to Baptism*, whom God is pleas'd to own, and take into Covenant with himself. And then though there could be no one or other particular Text produc't from the word of God for the Salvation of such Infants (though we have produc't one, to which Mr. Calamy makes no reply) yet if it be *certain by the Word of God*, that *some* Infants are taken into Covenant with God, and have a Right to Baptism for Sealing and Confirming that Covenant to them, and for assuring the Blessings promis'd therein, and that those whom God is pleas'd thus to take into Covenant with himself, dying without actually violating the Covenant on their parts, which is Seal'd to them in Baptism, are saved (none of which *Postulata* Mr. Calamy will deny) then it is a necessary consequence, that it is *certain by the Word of God*, that such Children so dying before they commit actual Sin are saved. The Premisses are *certain by the Word of God*, therefore so is the Conclusion. And the Rubrick cannot possibly be intended of any

other Infants, as of Pagans, Mahometans, Jews, &c. that in their present state have no Right to Baptism.

As to the *Regeneration* mention'd in the *Office of Baptism*, we shew'd, it is fairly understood of a *Sacramental Regeneration*; yea that it must be understood so, by comparison with the *Office of Adult-Baptism*; where they are said to be *now Regenerated* viz. in Baptism, who yet are suppos'd to be truly Regenerated, i. e. to have Faith and Repentance before (which Mr. Calamy takes no notice of.) We shew'd, that the Scripture, which is our Rule, and the Rule of the Church in making her *Offices*, speaks also in the same manner. Nothing of all this can He deny, or by Argument *disprove*. He saith p. 138. Mr. Ollyffe says, that a *Sacramental Baptismal Regeneration* is therein *imply'd*. This is not deny'd. Nay in the same Page, He saith, *the Phrases us'd in the Common-prayer on this Head are not blameable, for they are Scriptural*. Yet He will not yield, but adds a Parenthesis (that we may find fault with *using Scriptural Expressions besides Scripture sense, which is the Case of Biddle's Catechism*.) But have we wrested any Scripture contrary to what He himself believes to be the *Scripture sense* and Genuine design of the Place? or why must such a Passage be put in, to make

make his Reader believe that we had us'd the Scripture, as *Biddle* do's, when He do's not pretend to Enervate or Weaken the force of the Application of any one Scripture we alledg'd to this purpose?

Yet so loth is He to agree any thing in this Matter, that He reflects upon two other passages in the Liturgy, which He would insinuate not to be according to Scripture use. The one is the Clause in the *Office of Confirmation*; *Thou hast given to them the Forgiveness of all their Sins*. Here He thinks there is great Reason for Objection, if we consider of what sort of Persons this is spoken, *viz. when a Parcel of Lewd Boys are offer'd to be confirm'd*. Which last words only serve to prejudice his Reader, and to darken the Argument. If any such *Lewd Boys*, (known to be so) are *Offer'd* and not rejected, sure we are, it is contrary to the *Common prayer*. The Persons to be confirm'd are requir'd to be of *competent Age*; which is an Addition made at the last Review of the Liturgy to prevent Persons being Confirm'd too Young; which is left to the Judgment of the Minister of the Parish, as is also their *Fitness* for Confirmation; who is requir'd either to bring them himself, or to send their Names in writing with his hand subscrib'd; and after all, they are to be approved by the Bi-

shop. If these Rubricks are not always observ'd, the fault is Personal. Before these are confirm'd, every one is requir'd Audibly and severally to profess, that *they do in the presence of God and of this Congregation renew the Solemn Promise and Vow that was made in their Name at Baptism, Ratifying and Confirming the same in their own Persons, acknowledging themselves bound, &c.* This being done the *Bishop* immediately prays for them, therein acknowledging the Baptismal Privilege, that God had *given to them forgiveness of all their Sins.* *given*, i. e. by Promise and Covenant according to the Terms and Conditions by them Avouch'd and Renew'd, and by God Seal'd in Baptism according thereunto. Thus the Words *Given* is us'd in the very Description of a Sacrament in the Catechism. *An outward and visible sign of an Inward and Spiritual grace given to us, &c.* viz. by way of Promise and Covenant according to the Conditions thereof. The Bishop lays on his hands with Prayer, certifying them of the favour of God, Ministerially only, and conditionally upon the Conditions before by them expressly Avouch'd and Renew'd. And what is this more than what Mr. Calamy grants, p. 139. *that in Baptism Remission of Sins is seal'd Conditionally to all.*

The

The other place excepted against is the 2d Answer in the *Catechism*, wherein the Baptiz'd Person is said, to be *made a Member of Christ, a child of God, and an Inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven*. And we thank Him, that by quoting a Place, wherein so many Phrases are used (all own'd to relate to the same thing) we have scope to shew from the constant Tenour of Scripture the proof of this fœderal and Sacramental *Regeneration*. The Scripture sets forth, That by Baptism, They are *made Members of Christ*, i. e. of his Body the Church, *all Baptiz'd into one Body*. 1 Cor. 12. 13. yea that there are *Members of Christ*, that afterwards are made *the Members of a Harlot*, 1 Cor. 6. 15. and *Branches in Christ*, that yet are cut off and cast away. *John*. 15. 2. That they are *made the Children of God*; so call'd, *Deut*. 14. 1. being the *Children of the Covenant*, *Acts*. 3. 25. *To whom belongs the Adoption*, *Rom*. 9. 4. even though afterwards they *rebel against Him*, *Isa*. 1. 2. That they are *made Heirs of the Kingdom of Heaven*; that the Gentiles became *fellow-Heirs* with the Jews, *Eph*. 3. 6. though there be *Children of the Kingdom cast out into outer darkness*, *Mat*. 8. 12. By all these Passages it appears, that Children are by Baptism brought fœderally into a new State, are become Mem-

bers of the Body of Christ, stand in a new and near Relation to God as his Children, the Children of the Covenant. And this is call'd *Regeneration*. Mr. Baxter saith, (*Unnecessary Separation disown'd*, p. 1.) *To be Baptized is to be solemnly Invested in a visible State of Regeneration, Pardon, Adoption and Right to Christ and Life eternal, by a Ministerial delivery of such Right, as in the Name of Christ.* And this was the use of the Word amongst the Jews, signifying the new State of a Profelyte in his new Relation to God. And so *Regeneration* is taken in the Collect for *Christmas-Day*; where there is the Expression of *being Regenerate and made the Children of God by Adoption*; it is spoken of a visible *Regeneration* by taking us into the Number of his Adopted Children. And this is done *by the Spirit*, by his Order, Direction, and Guidance. And so it is understood in the Article, wherein Baptism is said to be a *sign of Regeneration or new Birth*, whereby, as by an instrument, they who receive Baptism rightly, are grafted into the Church: the Promise of forgiveness of Sins, of our Adoption to be the Sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly Sign'd and Seal'd. This is as plain an account of the Matter, one would think, as could be desir'd, and of the sense of the Church in this Case;

Case: And by this, which is the declared *Doctrine* of the Church, the Expressions in her *Offices* in all reason ought to be explain'd. It is a *Sign* of Regeneration or new birth; This *Regeneration* or new birth is explain'd by *being grafted into Christ's Church* (which is his Body) and by having the promises of forgiveness of Sins, and of our Adoption to be the Sons of God *visibly Sign'd and Seal'd*. This is the meaning of *Regeneration* in the *Articles*, and why should not this be the meaning of *Regeneration* in the *Offices*?

Against all this, He has one main Objection, *viz.* that such words *may encourage Persons to rest in the outward Administrations*, p. 136. and *may ensnare many*, p. 139. But if this be according to the way of Scripture in expressing the same thing, it must needs be very safe to use it, and very dangerous to give it hard words. To say they are *regenerated by Baptism*, is not more encouraging them to rest in the outward Covenant, than to say, *The Children are Holy*, 1 Cor. 7. 14. or that they *were purg'd from their old Sins*, though they live to forget it, 2 Pet. 1. 9. And if any Persons in this Church understand these passages otherwise than we do, it is upon this Account, that they think that *Regeneration*, and the Fa-
vour

vor of God in remission of Sins, may be lost; which must necessarily keep them from being encourag'd by these words to think they are safe and need no further work; so that if they argue consistently with their own Principles they must and do acknowledge as much need of Conversion, of Repentance and Faith in the Adult, as others do.

But we do not by this insinuate as if there were no danger of Mens being encouraged by their being in the outward Covenant to rest there. It is the ruin of Multitudes, to say *within themselves* (presumptively) *that they have Abraham to their Father; that they are not born of Fornication* (i. e. in an Idolatrous Church) *but have one Father even God.* It is the great work of a Minister diligently to teach the People the difference between a *few outwardly*, and a *few inwardly*; how all are not *Israel* who are of *Israel*. And when ever He useth the Office of Baptism, He may before or after, caution the People, as much as He sees good, against trusting to the outward Baptism; we are fully satisfy'd with what Mr. Calamy quotes from Bp. Burnet p. 136. and do and must inculcate it upon the People. Yet this supposed danger must not make us to deny the Words us'd by the

Holy

Holy Ghost in Scripture, or to think our selves wiser than He, by refusing to use them in the Sense that they are used there. Notwithstanding that the Nicene Creed is oftner us'd than the Office of Baptism, yet Mr. Calamy subscribes that Creed, and in it those words, *I believe one Baptism for the Remission of Sins.* When Mr. Baxter and others desir'd Alterations in the Liturgy, the 2d Answer in the Catechism was desired to be alter'd thus. Q. *What mercy did you Receive from God in the Covenant of Baptism?* A. *God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as my Reconciled Father, my Saviour, and my Sanctifier did forgive my original Sin, and receive me as a Member of Christ and of his Church, and as his Adopted Child and Heir of Heaven.* Baxter's life, pt. 3. p. 32. And we appeal even to Mr. Calamy whether this be not equally subject to his Exceptions, as easily abus'd to encourage Persons to rest in the outward Administration, and to ensnare Men, as any thing that is in the present Forms.

The French Reform'd Churches apprehend no unfitness in these expressions. In their Form for Baptism we find these words. Or *quand il nous remonstre nostre milheurtè, il nous console semblablement par sa misericorde, nous promettant de nous regenerer par son S. Esprit en une nouvelle vie: laquelle nous soit*

soit comme une entree en son Royaume. Ceste Regeneration consiste en deux parties—Toutes ces graces nous sont conferees quand il lui plaist nous incorporer en son Eglise par la baptisme, car en ce Sacrement il nous testifie la remission de nos pechez.—

And lastly, the same danger would be, if these Scripture Expressions were left out. The Devil and their own wicked Hearts would put many upon resting on the outward Covenant; and to cry out, *we are of the Church, and for the Church, The Temple of the Lord, The Temple of the Lord are we;* and it would require the utmost care of Ministers to prevent it. Nay, it appears from Mr. Baxter that the Anabaptists lay their charge against Infant-baptism it self from this prejudice. *Scripture proof of Infant-Church-membership.* ch. 6. where He cites the Objection from *Tomb's Apol. p. 94. in these words. Infant Baptism is the Ground upon which innumerable People, Ignorant and Prophane, harden themselves as if they were good Christians, regenerate, and should be sav'd without Holiness of Life, never owning or considering any profession or promise made for them as theirs.* And much of Mr. Baxter's Answer to the Anabaptists in this place, may be return'd to Mr. Calamy's Objection in this matter.

II. We come now to the business of *Godfathers* and *Godmothers*; the objections against which He doth continue to aggravate, and we shall go on to obviate.

Of Godfathers, and Godmothers.

1. The first thing He insists on, is concerning the *excluding of the Parents by the Godfathers and justling them out from their right*, &c. p. 152. This in our Defence we had deny'd, and we need only to add to what we have said, that though we pretend not to know what He has seen in his Travails that He tells us of, p. 150. yet the *Liturgies* of the *Reformed Churches* are as visible to us as to Him. In the *French Discipline*, Ch. 11. there be 6 or 7 *Canons* about *Godfathers*, whose names are order'd to be registred by *Can. 18.* and throughout the whole *Form* of the Administration of *Baptism* we find no mention made of any Act done or word spoken by the *Parents*. In the *Common-prayer* of *Zurich* and the Adjacent Countries in *Switzerland*, The Answers are all made by the *Godfathers* and *Godmothers* without any mention made of the *Parents*; and we know not that ever they were accus'd of *justling out the Parents from their Right*, &c. And that Mr. Calamy may believe what we have set down to be the united

ted Sense of the Church of England, even Bp. Morley (the Man said to be *in the secret*) in his strictures upon Mr. Baxter's Proposals, gives us his judgment in this matter. *Baxter's life*, pt. 3. p. 118. Mr. Baxter's 3d Proposal was, *Let not Christian Parents be forbidden to dedicate their Children publickly.* The Bishop answereth *Christian Parents are not forbidden to present their Children to be baptized: but the Church in Favour to the Infants appoints others (in case the Parents should dye or neglect their duty) to have a paternal Care of them in order to their Education, for the performance of their baptismal Covenant.*

2. The greatest thing He goes upon is, to prove baptism set by us upon an insufficient bottom, p. 153. that is, that baptism is by us bottom'd on the Covenant engagements of the Surety, p. 154. Here He distinguisheth between Witnesses or cautionary undertakers, as He calls them, to the Church, and covenanting Sponsors or Sureties: the former He allows, and saith, they are very desirable, and that there is no just ground of complaint against them. But He, adds, the grievance is with respect to the latter, that these God-fathers and Godmothers according to the method of the Church are taken in as Parties; in the federal stipulation between God and the party baptiz'd, which is not easie to be accounted for, while the Parents stand by for Cyphers: and though they

they may be present, yet they are not allowed what is their proper Work and Office; this is the exclusion complain'd of and hard to be justify'd. We answer, Parents in ordinary cases are to give a Right to the Children to Baptism, and are to present, dedicate, and give them up to God therein; This is their proper Work and Office, and they are not excluded from it, as Bp. Morley Himself declar'd; this belongs to the former objection. We are now upon another thing, the concern of Sureties lyes in another work, which is call'd by Mr. Calamy the being parties in the Stipulation between God and the Child: This we say, what ever it be, is consequent to the Child's Right to Baptism, and the Parental Presenting (as the Bishop calls it) of the Child thereunto. In this Work of Godfathers, Mr. Calamy supposeth two evils. 1. That Sureties, are intended to secure to Infants the Blessings of the Covenant, and therefore He tells us, p. 150. that the foreign Churches have no covenanting Sureties in order to the securing of the blessings of the Covenant to Baptiz'd Infants, and it were happy if the same could have been said of the Church of England. This is more fully charg'd on us, p. 154. 2. That Sureties are to bind the Children. He saith expressly, p. 156. That they are to bind to the duties of the Co-

venant, &c. The Impossibility of which supposition to be true, appears by the Office of Private Baptism from the *sufficiency* of it when there are no Sureties appointed. To this He saith, p. 155. *that it will come to be considered under the next Head*: but by his leave there is no such way to shuffle it off. *Under the next Head*, He considers whether we have power to use the Form of Private Baptism in the Case by us mention'd: but we are to consider here that Baptism so administred is *Full and Sufficient* which He cannot deny without opposing the express words of the Church; when immediately after private Baptism it is said, *Let them not doubt but the Child so Baptized* (viz. without Sureties or any other Ceremony) *is lawfully and sufficiently Baptiz'd*: and by consequence the blessing of the Covenant are *secured* without Sureties, and the Child *bound* to the duties of the Covenant without them. And when sometimes Sureties are brought to represent a Child that had been Baptiz'd (perhaps several months before) as is allowed to be done; these cannot *secure* Blessings and *bind* to Duties, when that *Security* and *Bond* is declar'd *Full and Sufficient* before ever they are brought: And therefore cannot be suppos'd to do so in Publick Baptism.

The truth is, the fundamental Reason or Bottom as He calls it, on which Infant-baptism is founded is not expressly declar'd by the Church in this Office; but both here and in the Catechism is supposed and taken for granted. We told Mr. Calamy in our Defence, p. 36. *That the foundation of Infant-baptism is two-fold.* First, on God's part, his gracious promise to Believers and their Seed, by which he comprehends their Children in the bonds of the Covenant; Secondly, on the part of the Children, their Obligation to the Terms and Conditions of the Covenant, which we maintain against the Anabaptists they are capable of being brought under. We told Him that the *Foundation* of his mistake (if it may be still call'd a Mistake) is his confounding the Covenant it self with the Declaration of it before the Church. Thus the Covenant on God's part, which the Minister declares, *Secures the Blessings of the Covenant* Conditionally to the Party Baptiz'd; not the Minister's Declaration of it: for it was and would be as effectually secur'd, if no Declaration were at that time made by the Minister of it. In like manner the Covenant on the part of the Baptiz'd, declar'd by the Sureties, *Binds to the duties of the Covenant*; it is not the Surety's Declaration of it

L

it

The

t that do's it; for it is done without it in the Case just now mention'd, and is always done in Baptism it self, and so the Party is and would be as effectually Bound, if there were no Sureties to declare it. But He saith p. 156. *Godfathers not only declare the Children bound, but they Actually bind them.* We have prov'd the contrary, and how will He prove this against us? Why by the Question in the Catechism. *Dost thou think thou art bound to believe and to do as they have promis'd for Thee?* which He explains thus; *if they are bound by their promise then there is more than a Declaration.* But is the being bound to do as they promised for them, the same thing with the being Bound by their, i. e. the Surety's Promise, as if they were Bound the more because they promis'd it in their Name? No, by no means. The Children are bound by their own Promise or Covenant engagement, which their Sureties only declar'd even as they Promised or Declar'd the Promise for them in their Name or Room. So in the other place in the Catechism. *They, i. e. the Children promise them both* — it is their own Promise, their own Obligation to the Covenant seal'd in Baptism, that Binds them, though they could not then declare it, but others (for Reasons afterwards mention'd) did it in their Name. Thus God promiseth these things by his Ministers: — They promise

Promise and Engage these things in his Name; He is pleas'd to Bind Himself to do, a *Sw* promise in his Name. Yet is He not bound by our promising for Him or in his Name; but the promise is the same whether we declare it or no. So Children promise these things by their Sureties. Sureties Promise and Vow these things in their Name. Children are bound to do as they promis'd for them; but not the more because they declar'd the Promise for them; the promise, had been the same to all intents and purposes if it had not been at that time declar'd. There being in all this an Easie and Common Metonymie, *Patronus pro Cliente*. Dr. Burgess in his *Defence of Bp. Morton. Preface.* p. 25. thus sets it down: *I conceive that these Interrogatories made to the Infant, and answer'd as in his Name by the Sureties, intend only an Adumbration of that Stipulation, which is really entred into by receiving the Sacrament of Baptism*—— Nor was this only that Doctor's private Judgment, but this was insert'd with other things in an Instrument presented to His Majesty K. James I. by the Then Bp. of Winchester, and afterwards to the Archbishop. Under which is written, *These interpretations K. James accepted. And my Lord's Grace of Canterbury affirm'd them to be the true Sense and Intention of the*

I 2

Church

Church of England. How would Mr. Calamy triumph, could He find such a Decla-

* See more
to this pur-
pose in Dr.
Falkner's
Lib. Eccles.

1. r. c. s. s.
7. Dr. Whit-
by's Prot. Re-
con. pt. 2. c. 1.
9.

ration for any of his Interpretations! * But Here it may be said, if this be the *true Sense and Intention of the Church*; if this be all, and the Child has the *Blessing secur'd*, and is bound to the *Terms of the Covenant* without any respect to Godfathers;

Then for what end are they enjoy'd and to what use do they serve? We answer, Not to add any thing to the *Essence* or *Substance* of Baptism; but to render the publick Administration thereof more for the *Edification of the People*.

To the *Essence* of Baptism, there is only necessary that the party baptiz'd have a *Right* to the *Blessings* of the *Covenant* (which in *Infants* is ordinarily upon their being the *Seed* of professed *Believers*, and sometimes may be some other way) and that they be bound to the *Duties* of the *Covenant*; which *Blessings* and *Obligations* are seal'd by *Washing with Water* in the *Name* of the *Blessed Trinity*. Though this is all that is essentially necessary, yet it is judg'd requisite (according to the general order, that in the Church, *All things should be done for edifying*) that there should be some distinct

distinct profession of the Covenant for the better instructing the Congregation, and stirring them up to their Duty. Two ways have been propos'd for the doing of this: both of them may be us'd; neither of them are of necessity; one may be omitted, and the other us'd, as each Church shall agree and appoint. The one is, for the Parent to make profession of the Covenant in his own name, and publickly to declare his solemn devoting his Child to God. If any Church had prescrib'd a Form for the doing this, we deny not, but in most ordinary Cases it would be very useful: The other is, for the Covenant to be declar'd, that the Child enters into, and by which it is ever after bound. *This* is a distinct thing from the Parent's Convenanting and devoting his Child; which in this Office is suppos'd, and known, by *signifying his desire to the Minister*, choosing the Godfathers, *presenting* (as Bishop Morley's Phrase is) the Child to Baptism: *This*, we say, is distinct from that, and serving for another use; *viz.* A distinct Understanding of what Baptism engageth to, an Admonition to the Hearers to remember their Engagements, &c. Now who shall make this Declaration, and in what proper words, is meerly circumstantial: None is so proper as the Minister to declare the

Covenant on God's part, and in his Name; and nothing hinders but that He might declare the Covenant in the Child's Name too; but yet this way of declaring it by Interrogatories and Answers thereto, may be very useful and affecting.

Mr. Calamy indeed saith, *The Questions in the Office are not easily accounted for*; and the Godfathers Answers are a *Mimical Profession*. But let it be observ'd, That Covenants are wont to be transacted by way of Question and Answer; and this is the expresse way of Covenanting, when Adult Persons are baptiz'd, 1 Pet. 3. 21. The Baptiz'd in their own Name, and by their own Act, enter into a Stipulation to renounce the Devil, &c. express their *Belief in God*, &c. and engage themselves to Obedience. In conformity therefore to this Practice, it is thought fit by the Church, that the Covenant on the Child's part should be declar'd in the same Form and Manner, by Questions put and Answers return'd. Now the Child in its Infant-state, being not able to make these Answers. Godfathers are brought to represent the Child, and in his Name to make the Responses to the Covenanting Words, exprest by the Minister. Then is Baptism administered as a Seal and Confirmation, both of the Promise and Covenant on God's part (declar'd

(declar'd by the Minister *in God's Name*) for assurance and conveyance of the Benefits contain'd therein; and also of the Covenant on the Child's part (declar'd by the God-fathers *in the Child's Name*) for his engagement by that Covenant to be the Lord's. Now the Sense being agreed, why should there be so much Dispute about a Form of Words, especially when they are so very apt to express that Sense? It is the Covenant seal'd in Baptism that ensures and engageth; the Declaration of it at that time is only for the Edification of the Congregation; the doing it by Interrogatories to the Sureties, is a meer Circumstance.

This is the plain Account of this matter according to the Office of Baptism in the Common-prayer, which Mr. Calamy so mistakes, though we think that even upon his own suppositions He do's much overlash in many of his Expressions. For if the Words of this Form would admit it, or there were some other Form compos'd for it, we see not why Godfathers might not represent the Parents also; or other Persons giving a Right to Children to be Baptized, in Cases where Parents have not a Right themselves, or where they may be suppos'd to have forfeited it; in which Cases they may become more especially useful.

Mr. Calamy saith, p. 154. *The Parent cannot transfer his Right, if Himself be capable of acting according to it.* If the Right here spoken of, be his Right publicly to devote his Child to God before the Church, it is his bare assertion that *He cannot transfer it,* without the least proof. Where is the Rule that tyeth up Parents to do this in their own Persons only? He saith, p. 156. *He cannot perceive any warrant for them to authorize Substitutes herein to act for them:* But can He perceive any thing that hinders or forbids them to do it? We have no reason to take it, that they cannot do it, upon his bare word, without any reason at all that He can shew, or we can think of. One would think the *Sponsors Act* by the Parents order and in their stead ought to be interpreted as the *Parents Act*, for what mighty difference is there between the Parents acting immediately by themselves in their own Persons, or mediately by others deputed by them for that purpose; unless there were some positive Law or manifest Reason which did confine this only to the Parents? For our parts we know of none such, nor has Mr. Calamy shewn us any. He only saith, p. 156. *That Children are a part of their Parents; and as it is through them that the Children have a Right to the blessings of* the

the Covenant, so it is they that are to put in their claim to them, &c. So we say, they do, and must do, in the inward and spiritual Acts of Faith and Prayer; and this is imply'd in their offering their Children to Baptism; and even as to the outward and expresse acting therein, if they appoint others to do it for them, they do it. He saith, the Parents are hereby excluded from the solemn Stipulation. But Mr. Baxter saith, Christ. Direct. pt. 3. Qu. 41. that the Parents may agree that the Godfathers may speak the Covenanting Words as their Deputies, primarily and in their stead, and secondarily as Friends that promise their assistance. If they agree that others should do it for them, how are they excluded? Thus upon his own Suppositions his Aggravations are unjust. It is said in the Gospel they brought little Children to Him. It is not said they were their Parents, it may be, they were their Kindred, it may be, others.

This superadded use of Godfathers besides that representing the Child, in which only the Form is concern'd, is more evident in Case the Parents have no Right or have forfeited their Right. Mr. Calamy tell us, p. 168. He is not averse to Bp. Stillingfleet's distinction of admitting some Children to Baptism in the Right of their Parents, and others in the

the Right of the Church, and, p. 154. He saith, *He is not dispos'd to call in question the Churches having a Right to offer such Children to Baptism as have no parental Right.* We think therefore it was too confidently insisted upon before to be the Parents Right only. But if the Church may do it, we ask, How, and by whom? How shall the Church do it but by some or other, who are delegated by it thereunto? He saith, p. 161. *He has a Latitude enough to suppose the Church may have a Right in a Christian Country to baptize Infants, whose Parents have no Right to offer them to God in Baptism, as in the Case of Bastards and the Children of Persons excommunicated, &c. they must be offer'd to God in Baptism then by some Body:* But, he saith, p. 154. *the Admission of such must not be ascrib'd to the covenanting of their Sureties for them,* and p. 168. *they must not pretend to covenant for them,* but who must do it, if they do not do it? The Parents, He allows, may do this for Children when they have a Right; and when the Parents have no Right, He allows, the Church must do, what the Parents should do; the Parents Right is devolv'd upon the Church; and the Church must appoint some to do what the Parents were to have done, had they had a Right; which is to admit of Godfathers as covenanting Sponsors, in defect

defect or failure of the Parent or their Right. To this purpose the Learned *Amesius* speaks, *De conscientia*, Cap. 27. *Qui aliquo modo in professione sua ad ecclesiam pertinent sed fœdus tamen Dei aperte violant, eorum infantes cum aliqua discrimine debent baptizari, ita scil. ut quod fœdus requirit & in ipsis deest, per alios, quantum fieri potest, suppleatur*—*Excommunicatorum contumacium liberos non expedit baptizari, nisi sponsorum idoneorum interven- tu.* How far the Office of Baptism may be accommodated to these exempt Cases, we determine not; it plainly supposeth the Parents Right, and expresseth the Covenant between God and the Baptiz'd, as is before at large explain'd.

3. We now proceed to his 3d Objection. It seems a wonderful thing to us that Mr. *Calamy*, should continue to insist so much upon the *Abuses* committed in the matter of Godfathers: if He did bring this in as a digression, we should only tell Him, that we bewail these things as well as He; but what is this to our *Subscription* or *Declaration* about which our present Dispute is? Do we subscribe or declare our Assent to the negligence or carelessness either of Ministers or Godfathers? Do we by consenting to the use of Godfathers consent to the abuse of them? We leave it to any indifferent Judges, whe-

whether Mr. Calamy had not much better to have said nothing than to discourse as He do's about this matter. He is so kind as to grant us two things. He grants (at least seemingly) the Lawful use of Sureties in the Churches abroad, p. 150. He grants the Lawfulness, yea, expediency of some use of Godfathers. He saith, p. 151. that *there would be no just ground of complaint against Witnesses of the Parents Faith and Profession, and Sureties to the Church that the Children should be brought up in the Profession of the true Religion.* Again He saith *Witnesses all admit, and Sureties to the Church for the Education of Infants is very desireable.* And yet, p. 158. He makes Godfathers in the way of the Church one great occasion of the general prophana-tion of this ordinance, which He grounds upon the wickedness and carelessness of the Godfathers. When We had told Him, that our consent to the use of them, had no manner of reference to other Mens Abuse thereof; He answers, *A poor excuse is better than none, but if this be a poor Excuse, what better have the other re-formed Churches in whom He approves this use? Or what better excuse has Mr. Calamy who had said before, that Sureties for the Education of Children are very desireable?* He saith, *there is no just ground of complaint against them,* and yet He brings a Complaint that

that always there has been but too much ground and occasion for, if it were admitted to be just. We say then, that notwithstanding the abuse, there is a great and acknowledg'd use and benefit of Godfathers. He saith Himself, p. 157. *I'll freely own, that I do not doubt, but some Godfathers have been more careful, in the Education of some Children they have stood for at the Font, than many Parents. I have no doubt of the Truth of what is cited from the Reverend Dr. Bray which was in our Defence, p. 39. that thousands of Persons have been happily brought up to a good understanding and sense of Religion by the sole Care of their Godfathers and Godmothers.* Now if He has no doubt of this (as He saith) We think that He, as well as we, should prize the use of Godfathers; especially if we consider that the same Abuses would be, if there were no Godfathers; yea worse, wicked Parents would be wicked and unnatural to their Children, if there were no Godfathers; they may prove of use to the Parents by admonishing them to their duty towards their Children, and in the Instruction and Education of their Children, but we see not how they can be any hindrance.

We cannot but fear, but Mr. Galamy's way of dealing with us proves the greatest occasion

casion of the *abuse*, and the greatest hindrance of that use of Godfathers, *against which* He knows *there is no just Objection*; for when by these unjust Calumniation's set off with Wit and Reflections, Honest and serious Persons are prejudic'd against undertaking the Work of Godfathers (which is really the Case of many at this day) and others are willing to find matter of excuse therein to ease themselves of the trouble; the work comes to fall into the hands of those He objects against. It is hard that when He has done all He can to discourage serious Persons from undertaking so good a Work, that He should lay the Scandals at the Door of others, which He himself has caus'd. We cannot but judge, He has contracted great guilt by this way of Writing.

-A However what Abuses soever they be, we are no ways concerned therein but to bewail them, and (as much as may be) to prevent them: If there be such a sort of Men as He speaks of, p. 158. we are very sorry for it, though we are not bound to believe it upon his insinuation: We get the best security we can, according to the Degree of trust we have in the Parents, and the need that we suppose they and their Children may have of them. We have (as He desires, p. 158.) considered whether it be

in our Power to do any thing towards the preventing the abuse, when once we have consented to the use. And whether we have not put it out of our power to prevent the abuses. And we answer him, that we have not by any Act of ours put it out of our Power to prevent the Abuses, yea so far are we from it, that (though it be not in our power wholly to do it) yet we have much more power by our publick Ministry to prevent Abuses of this kind, than otherwise We could have. And whereas He asks us, *whether we can oblige the Parents to being sober Persons, and can refuse to admit the Lewdest Persons to stand for their Neighbours Children?* We answer Him, we have power as to the latter, and (as He owns) a Canon to back us. And though, p. 163. He imagines that to be *obsolete*; yet may there be more use made of it than He imagines: And if others have power to receive other Canons (as He sometimes tells us) then have we to receive this upon any fitting occasion. And if we take sometimes meaner Security, which can prove but a less help to the Parents or Children than we could wish; yet even a less help is better than none; seeing every Parent is most engag'd for his own Child, and his care thereof is no way hindered by the Additional Security but advanc'd.

III. The next Accusation is, That we are oblig'd to deny the Ordinance of Baptism to Children, whose Parents do immoveably scruple Surerries. Such exclusive terms of Communion He bitterly inveighs against, and aggravates in two Instances more, *viz.* The excluding from Baptism Children, whose Parents scruple the Sign of the Cross; and from the Lord's Supper those, who scruple Kneeling. To all these we gave Answer to much the same purpose, and doubt not fully to defend what we have said. To which a Minister, in a printed *Letter*, intituled, *A Letter to Mr. Ollyffe*, has added these words, p. 19. Positive Laws do not bind *ad semper*, as our Lord shews in case of the Sabbath, *Matth.* 12. It is reasonable that in all cases of necessity (extraordinary and perhaps unforeseen) there should be some Relaxation of the Law, according to the general grounds of Equity. And though no such allowance or Dispensation were given in the Liturgy, yet it is reasonable that it should always be presum'd and suppos'd. There is no particular mention of the Private Baptism of the Adult, yet it is manifest in some cases it must be allow'd; as in the case of dangerous Sicknes, of Persecution, &c.

Thus

Thus Bishop Hall in his *Apology against the Brownists*, Sect. 42. gives five Limitations of the use of the enjoyn'd Ceremonies; the last of which is, *That Men be not so ty'd to them, but that by occasion they may be omitted, so it be without offence or contempt.* And one would think, that it should always be allow'd as most reasonable, that the lesser should give place to the greater. And if in case of a Divine Command, where God hath commanded Sacrifice and Mercy both, and when one doth interfere with the other, *Sacrifice*, as the lesser, must for that time be left undone; one would think it should much more hold in a case between the Commands of God and Men; and a few unnecessary things enjoyn'd by Man, though in themselves lawful, yet being verily thought unlawful by Men of well-meaning Minds, should be omitted for that time, rather than the Ordinances of God themselves should be so, and rather than there should be a Schism made, &c.

But before we make a new Reply to Mr. Calamy's fresh onset, we crave leave to premise, That we agree with that *Letter* further, in p. 23. thereof, That we do not condemn all Impositions, that may *accidentally* prove exclusive terms of Communion to some. There is a vast difference between things *unlawful*

in themselves, and so in their own Nature are unwarrantably made terms of Communion at any time; which is the case with respect to many Impositions in the Church of *Rome*: and those things that are *in themselves* lawful, but are only scrupled by some, whether they are so. The Imposition of the former is in its self unwarrantable and wicked, but not so of the latter; though such Impositions may *accidentally* prove exclusive Terms of Communion to some, by reason of their Misapprehension of things. And Mr. *Calamy* and his Brethren must be of the same Mind, if they will judge consistently with their own Principles, and Concessions, and Practices in other things of this Nature——So the same Arguments that Mr. *Calamy* brings against the Cross, Godfathers, and Kneeling, *meerly* as made Terms of Communion, do hold against all Determinations of Circumstances in the Worship of God, which any others do scruple, and thereby would be debarr'd Communion with us——So the Argument against Imposition of only *accidentally exclusive* Terms of Communion proves too much, if it proves any thing, and more than Mr. *Calamy* desires it should. In that *Letter* there are Instances of *Stinted Forms of Prayer* scrupled by many, especially as impos'd, Determinations of Time, Place, and

and other Circumstances, which many have scrupled and oppos'd: Yet these Determinations are lawful, yea requisite to be made, in the Opinion of many of our Dissenting Brethren. *Baxter's Christ. Direct.* Tom. 3. Qu. 133. They do themselves not only practice divers of these, which others scruple; but offer to comply with these Determinations, though others might be debarr'd for their Non-compliance. And if these Determinations were alter'd (as for instance no *set Form* us'd) the same Inconveniencies would happen the other way to the Exclusion of others, who are for *Set Forms*, because of the Mistakes and Indecencies, which they apprehend would be committed; at least, by some Ministers in the Ministration of the publick Offices. Thus far that *Letter*.

We add, as to the very matter now before us, concerning those that scruple Godfathers, what we find decreed by a National Synod of the Evangelical Churches in *France*. 2d Synod of *Paris*, Chap. 6. *There being no Commandment from the Lord, that we should take Godfathers and Godmothers to present our Infants unto Baptism, we cannot therefore impose an expresse Necessity on any one to use them: Nevertheless this Custom being very Antient, and brought into the Church on a good intent, viz. To testify the Parents Faith and Baptism*

of their Child, and to take upon them its Education in case of their Death; and for that it maintains Christian Society with a bond of Love and Alliance: Such as will not follow this Practice, but will in their own Persons present their Children to Baptism, are earnestly desired not to be conceited, but to conform to this antient and accustomed order, which we find both good and very beneficial.

We see not but Mr. Calamy (as far as He is now gone off from all concordant Churches) must own this. For He tells us, That a particular Congregation may and must make several Determinations or Impositions, mention'd p. 85. and saith just before, That to suppose the necessary Circumstances of Worship not determin'd for each Worshipping Assembly, would occasion endless confusion. He is well aware, it would be return'd, That these Circumstances when determin'd, may be scrupled; and then that Honest Men will pretend that they are shut out from Communion by imposing them. To this He answers with many softning words, p. 89. That there is a great deal of difference between not being able conveniently to communicate with this particular Congregation—and an Exclusion from all Worshipping Assemblies by a National Constitution. His circumstances making that inconvenient for Him, that is convenient for them,

them, naturally direct Him to joyn rather with some other Worshipping Assembly. Now this Answer may a little serve for the Nonconformists in London and Westminster; but suppose a Member of a Dissenting Congregation in a Countrey Town distant 10 or 12 Miles from any other dissenting Congregation, should scruple the Determination of such things as are set down p. 85. viz. Of some sort of Officers set up therein, and officiating there; or the Order determin'd therein; *The Form in which they sing*, or the Reading a Line between (which a National Synod of France forbad, and call'd *inepte*) He is as effectually excluded from all Religious Assemblies, as if the Constitution were National; unless He can with his Family go 12 Miles to worship.

But we speak not these things to Shift off a Reply to his Answer; in which we see nothing, but that we may be still of the same Mind, that when the Church gives us a Liberty to use the Form of Private Baptism (in which these scrupled things are not enjoin'd) *when need shall compel*, or when there shall be *great cause or necessity*; We have thereby leave to use it, when Persons do immutably scruple these Accidentals, and must else be thrown off from Baptism. *This* He saith, *He is afraid will not hold*. We fear

by his way of arguing with us, that He rather wisheth, that it may not hold. His reasons for his thoughts are these.

1. That the *Rubrick* refers to danger of death by sickness. This He proves by two passages in the *Rubricks*, the one supposing the *time* may require *haste*; the other speaking of something after to be done (*if the Child do afterwards live*) now though we question not, but other things may require *Haste* when a Minister is sent for to a private House, besides the sickness of the Child; and the *Life* of an Infant may be uncertain, though well when baptized: Yet we will freely allow Him, that without doubt *danger of Death* is one cause of private Baptism, and the most obvious cause, very frequently occurring; and He needed not have brought Dr. *Hammond*, Dr. *Camber* and Bp. *Sparrow* to prove what no body denies. But this we insist upon, that this is not the *only* cause. Nor is it imaginable, that such indefinite expressions would be us'd, as *when need shall compel*, and when there is a *great cause and necessity*, if only one thing unexpress'd had been intended: It would then have been much plainer to have said, *when the Child is sick and in danger of Death*, this is truly, and perhaps chiefly meant, but not only.

2. His other reason is, that He *can hardly suppose the Church would have given this single instance of her regard to tender Consciences, and not have taken notice of it, &c.* It do's too much appear, that He *can hardly suppose* any thing of *the Church* but what tends to prejudice Him. We do not know indeed that this was particularly design'd by appointing this Office: But this we say, that the excellent Compilers of the Office, did easily suppose that there would be *urgent causes for private Baptism* which in the particulars were not foreseen by them: And therefore they express things so indefinitely, leaving it to the Discretion of the Minister, to judge when any such *urgent cause* did happen. And that other such urgent causes (beside that which He mentions) do frequently happen is plain by all experience, *Distance of place from the Church, badness of Weather, &c.* are every Winter urgent causes in many Country Parishes; and have been possibly more frequently so than *danger of Death*. Sometimes *the want of proper Sureties* (which is near our case) has been adjudg'd so. And we know a Minister that since the publishing our *Defence* wrote to his *Diocesan*, in a difficult case about procuring Sureties, and receiv'd direction in answer thereunto, that He should baptize the Child privately. There is also a fre-

quent cause now as little foreseen (possibly) as the cause before us can be imagin'd to be, *viz.* when we see plainly, that if we do not go home to their Houses, they will neglect their Childrens Baptism, if not go off to the Anabaptists. And so far are they from being reck'ned but *half conformists* (as He surmizeth) that Baptize in private Houses; that nothing is more frequent in the *Great City* and indeed throughout the Land: And if He saith but *not without Godfathers*, &c. We agree it, we are empower'd to lengthen out the Office by the other of *Publick Baptism*; but it is manifest they are not requir'd therein, which is all we said.

3. Another Reason He urgeth is, that this *private Baptism is incomplete* (though He owns it to be declar'd *sufficient*, and that *no one must doubt of it*) so far as that an *Addition is expedient*: and He tells us, He is at a loss to distinguish between what is commended and what is enjoyn'd, That is very strange indeed. But He saith *shall* is us'd in this Rubrick, as well as in the Rest, but where is *shall* us'd? It is not, that they shall bring the Child to Church; but only that it is *expedient*: And if they do bring it to Church (which is judg'd *expedient* to be done, though the Minister can no way oblige them to it) then the Minister shall

certifie

certifie that He baptiz'd the Child. Whether any more be requir'd than that *certifying*, &c. if the Child be baptiz'd by the Minister of the Parish, is not exprest, though when it was baptized by others, there is. And the reason may be, that they might think fit to require greater Security for Children baptized by Strangers, than for those baptized by their own Minister, who had been Judge himself of the *urgent cause* for private Baptism. Whether this was so or no, we assert not; but though Mr. Calamy calls this *a pleasant turn*, yet it is most clear, that all that follows after the Ministers *certifying* the Congregation of his baptizing of the Child there brought *according to the due and prescrib'd order of the Church*, to the very end of the Office, hath reference in the exprest order of it only to the Children baptized by other Ministers; though the Practice with respect thereunto may sometimes have been otherwise. And plain it is, that when the Child is thus baptized privately, the Father, who scruples the Sureties, &c. could not be compelled to bring the Child to Church afterwards; in which Case only the *shall* takes place, and without which there is no Injunction on the Minister to do less or more.

But

But He yet mentions one thing more, p. 178. That to wave Sponsors, because they are scrupled, is in this Instance to supplant the Uniformity, which the Act of Parliament was design'd to settle. And unless the Constitution affords a Dispensation for omitting them, 'tis hard to say, what Warrant particular Ministers have to dispense with themselves. But if the Constitution do's afford a Dispensation for omitting them, then it is not hard to say, in these cases, that Ministers may dispense with them. The design of the Law is, no doubt, to settle Uniformity; but the Rule of this Uniformity is the Liturgy, which was settled by that Law. Now if the Liturgy in this case affords a Dispensation, the Law and Constitution afford a Dispensation. This is the Dispute before us: We say it doth, and we prove it by the Office of Private Baptism, which for great and necessary causes the Church do's allow. Whether or no, it had in its eye the immoveable Scruples of some about these things, amongst the great and necessary Causes, for which this Dispensation should be made, is more than Mr. Calamy can tell; and till He hath proved the contrary better than he has done, We are not bound to believe him, though He asserts it never so confidently. We cannot think otherwise for our parts, where there are invincible Scruples concern-
ing

ing the Lawfulness of these things, but that it is a very *great and necessary cause* for this Dispensation, of which we speak. For that Baptism be administred is necessary by a Divine Authority; but that it be administred always in the publick Congregation, or with Godfathers, is not necessary by any Command of God: and therefore if Persons do so scruple the Use of these unnecessary things, that they cannot consent to have Baptism administred with them, this is a very *great and necessary cause*, why it should be done without them; rather than it should be wholly omitted, or then there should be a Division made about it. It is certain the Church hath not by any Act or Declaration barr'd this from being one of those *great causes*, for which this Dispensation is to be allow'd. But the Minister himself is made the Judge of these *great and necessary Causes*. And a Minister may well think, the Dispensation *necessary* of unnecessary things rather than the necessary should be omitted, when this may be done in private, without noise or scandal; and when the Church has sufficiently provided for the Solemnity of all things in the publick Administration, the *Uniformity* of which was the great thing design'd by the Act. The same latitude is exprest and taken in other *Rubricks*, particularly in publick Baptism

Baptism on week-days; *If necessity so require, Children may be baptiz'd on any other day, viz. other than Lord's days and Holy days; which is such an allowance as leaves the Minister Judge of that necessity, and is so understood.*

The same that is said thus largely against our being bound to exclude the Children, whose Parents scruple Godfathers, holds in its full weight, and all its parts, as to what follows, that we are not bound to exclude those, whose Parents scruple the Sign of the Cross, and we shall make further Addition thereunto, save the Authority of Bishop King, who in his first *Admonition*, p. 41. giving the reason why He had not mention'd Baptism in his *Discourse* to the Dissenters, saith, *You have not the same constant necessity to joyn in Baptism; and your Exceptions against it could be no just reason to hinder your attendance in other ordinary parts of Worship, which you might very well do, though you scrupled baptizing your Children with the Sign of the Cross: especially since in case of necessity our Church had allow'd you Baptism for them without it or Godfathers, as appears in our Office of Private Baptism.*

IV. The next thing is the Use of the Sign of the Use of of the Cross. And Mr. Calamy begins with this, That the Act of the Sign of the Cross. Uniformity aims at obliging all to

a Conformity to the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, as well as to the Use of the Forms in the Liturgy, and therefore the Assent and Consent is to them, as well as to the Forms. And whoever deny'd this? But then the Assent and Consent is to the Rites and Ceremonies, as well as to the Forms, as they are set forth in the Liturgy; for it is the Liturgy that is confirm'd by that Act. And so far as the Liturgyleaves it to the Ministers discretion to use or omit them, so far the Act of Parliament leaves it to the Ministers discretion. And how far that is, we have shew'd already, and shall not repeat. Then He proceeds with this Reflection: Mr. Ollyffe could not satisfy Himself, without defending the Use of the Cross, notwithstanding He seems as willing it should be laid aside as us'd: We had not only been satisfy'd, but rejoyc'd to have no occasion for our Defence: but who can be satisfy'd or contented to be represented as usurping upon our Lord's Authority (to which we bow our Souls) in making a new Sacrament, or which is all one, a new Gospel? He knows we defended not the Imposing this (but wisht for his sake and others, it might be laid aside) but the Use of it: and sure we are, He would have triumph'd, if we had omitted this in our Defence; which now stands firm against all his

Oppo-

Opposition, after we have answer'd two things, which He here objects.

I. Whereas we had said, *The sign of the Cross was never pretended by the Church of England, to be a sign from God to Man, of any promise made by him, &c. but from Man to Man, notifying what is expected from the Baptiz'd Person.* He now saith, p. 186. *That though the words of the Common-prayer Book may fairly enough be reconciled with our Notion, yet He cannot say the same of the Canon, that was design'd to explain it. Be reconcil'd with our Notion, is a very diminutive Expression, when our Notion (as He calls it) is so evidently and expressly meant therein: But it is the Canon which He has wrested and tortur'd to contradict it. For that speaking of the Primitive Times, saith, This use of the sign of the Cross was held in the Primitive Church with one consent and great applause; and if any had then oppos'd it, they would have been censur'd, as enemies of the Name of the Cross, and consequently of Christ's Merits, the Sign whereof they could no better endure. Here He observes, That the sign of the Cross is said to be a sign of the Merits of Christ. And because the Church in the Canon declares, That She follows therein the Primitive and Apostolical Churches, He saith p. 187. It looks as if it were intended to carry in it something*
 -oggO of

of an Assurance, that an Interest in the Merits of Christ thereby signify'd, was convey'd by this Sign to the Baptiz'd. He saith, It looks as if this were so. He seems not to have confidence enough to assert it, but would insinuate it into the Belief of an unwary Reader, though he thereby reflects upon the Primitive and Apostolical Churches, as well as upon this. To explain then this Difficulty; We must distinguish between the Sign of the Cross, and the Signing of the Forehead with the Sign of the Cross. The Sign of the Cross simply and by it self, is much what one with the Name of the Cross; and the Name of the Cross is a Sign of the Cross (as all Words are Signs of things.) And the one and the other signify Christ crucify'd, his Merits and Death: but the signing the Forehead with this Sign, signifies the not being asham'd of his Merits and Death, but glorying therein. Now it is the Signing the Forehead with this Sign, which is the Use of it in the Church of England, and of the Meaning of which there is no doubt. We would therefore ask Mr. Calamy, Whether when the Primitive Churches are said to have sign'd the Forehead with the sign of the Cross, it was to be a means of conveying the merits of Christ thereby; or to be a Token that they were not asham'd of Christ's merits? He has not the confidence (we beleive) to say it was

was the former, but the latter. Mr. Baxter saith, *Five Disputat. Disp. 5. §. 19.* I durst not have reprov'd any of the Antient Christians, that us'd the sign of the Cross meerly as a professing signal Action, to shew to the Heathens and Jews about them, that they believ'd in a crucify'd Christ and were not asham'd of his Cross — to be instead of so many words q.d. [I thus profess my self the servant of a crucify'd Christ of whom I am not asham'd] whether these things be fit or unfit, the time, the place, the occasions, and other Circumstances must shew; but the lawfulness I dare not deny. Now as Mr. Calamy confesseth, it is the practice of the Primitive times that the Church professeth to imitate; which indeed made use of the sign of Christs merits, but how? not to convey Christ's Merits to them (as He would suppose) but by signing the forehead (which is the place of shame) therewith, to testifie they were not asham'd of Christ's merits, or (as our Liturgy expresseth it) of Christ Crucify'd. And so plain is this in our use thereof, that the Church allows not her Ministers once to make use of it, but at the same time they must in full and ample words declare that this is the meaning of it — in token that He shall not be ashamed, &c.

This being clear, the other word in the Canon of its being a *Dedicating Sign* mention'd

in another place and to another purpose, has the plain meaning, that we had assign'd to it in our Defence. Nor did the Convocation express themselves unaccountably (as He saith, p. 190.) if a *Dedicating* and a *declarative Sign* be all one: Seeing there is a just Account given of it in our Defence, and in the Appendix to Bishop King's Second Admonition, where He saith, p. 224. *We cannot be said to dedicate our selves to God by a Sign, for any other reason, but because it declares and signifies our Resolution and Promise to perform our Covenant with Him.* Thus when the Jews came to renew their Covenant, *Nehem. 9.* they not only come with *Sackcloth and Earth* upon them, v. 1. but use the outward Tokens of *Signing, Writing and Sealing*, to declare their *Dedication*. Thus it is also expressly explain'd in that Writing of Dr. Burgess mention'd before, so solemnly presented to the Higher Powers, and declar'd to be the true Sense and Intention of the Church of England.

And we declare, and declare again, That we mean no more, and are bound to mean or intend no more by it, than to use it as a declarative professing Sign of our *not being ashamed to own the Faith of Christ crucify'd.* If Men will put hard Senses and Constructions upon Words or Actions, that are not intended in them, who can help it? Mr. Baxter

N

saith,

saith, *The sense of the Law is to be judg'd of by the Law*: and by that there is all possible care taken against any superstitious use of this Sign; *by ascribing any vertue or efficacy to it, to exhibit, seal or confirm the Grace of God to us thereby.* And if such a sense must be put upon an Action, which is so contrary to all the Professions, Declarations and Protestations that can be made against it, it is very hard indeed. *The only Question will be, as Bishop King saith, 2d Admon. p. 221. Whether we or Mr. Boyse (who was the Disputant He had to deal with) know our Doctrine best.* And He justly complains of Him, *p. 142. That He will pretend to know the design of the Churches using the Cross, better than all her Sons, from the Learned Hooker to this day.* And *p. 209. For Him to put a sense on the words of our Canon, and make an Inference from them, that none of us own, but protest against, is to set up an Adversary purposely, that He may confute Him: and such proceedings are lookt upon by all impartial Men, as the effects of prejudice and engagement to a Party.*

After all that hath been said upon this Argument, it is plain that Mr. Calamy himself do's not believe, the Objections He has brought against the lawfulness of the Use of the Sign of the Cross, to have any weight in them. For *p. 196. He saith, He do's not think*

think the Controversy about this Ceremony, Whether it is of a Sacramental Nature or not, to be of that importance, as many have done on either side: yet He has urg'd it with as great vehemency as any. And p. 197. He saith, He won't censure those that use it; and that He won't say, it is to all unlawful to use it. And consequently, it cannot be unlawful in it self, for then it would be unlawful to all: and so all the Arguments which He has advanc'd against it, that it is made a means to convey the Merits of Christ, the Force and Effects of his Death, &c. are fallen to the ground. But He saith, If the Arguments brought against it, do not shew that it may not lawfully be used, yet He thinks enough has been said by many; that it cannot lawfully be impos'd, p. 196. And that to deny Baptism to them that scruple it, is an unspeakable hardship, and not to be justified, p. 197. However, let it be granted, that it may lawfully be us'd, and we have all that we need, as to this present Head. For as to the denying Baptism to Infants whose Parents scruple it, we have sufficiently shew'd, we are under no obligation thereunto by our Subscription or Declaration. And we cannot but wonder he should insist so much upon the Imposition in this Case, wherein He has to do with Submitters, and not with Imposers; and when He knows our Subscription and

Declaration is not concern'd with the Imposition. Yes, but He is against the Submission for the Imposition sake; for He saith, *When it is impos'd it may very warrantably be refus'd*; and, *He must insist on his Liberty (which no mortal has power to debar Him of) not to come under an obligation statedly to use it*; even then when he will not oppose the lawfulness of the use of it, in it self. But where is our Obedience then to our Superiours in lawful things, which the Scripture urgeth so much upon us? But He thinks that our Submission to the things impos'd, encourageth the Imposition; and that we become Accessary thereby to the continuance thereof. And if it be so, this is only accidental to our Obedience, which has only respect to the things commanded, and to the Command; and not to the Laying on the Command upon us; which is another Province and Business to look to, and not ours; whose Conscience is not concern'd in others Acts, otherwise than by shewing our dislike thereof, when they are guilty of an evil thing. But surely a Command of lawful things by a lawful Authority may oblige us to, but cannot hinder or disoblige us from the Practice of them in any circumstances whatsoever. If they that have the Authority abuse their Power, and command that which is inconvenient,

nient, we may remonstrate it to them in some other way, as far as may be consistent with the Subject's Reverence to Superiours. But if the things commanded are lawful in themselves, it is not the Inconvenience only that will render unlawful our Obedience. Let us not confound Duties and Sins. The Superiour's Duty is to command right things; the Subject's Duty is to obey in lawful things. The Subject has a *Judgment of Discretion* left him to consider his own Duty, which relates to the Lawfulness or Unlawfulness, of what He himself is to do, or not to do: The Superiour has a *Judgment of Discretion* to consider his own Duty. These are distinct the one from the other. But it will open a gap to a meer boundless Humour, if the Subject at his own Discretion should renounce Obedience to a lawful Authority imposing lawful things, because He may think upon some suppos'd Inconvenience or other, that Authority should not impose them. This is such a Liberty as God never gave unto Men; it is a meer unbridled Licentiousness, and not true Liberty, and only teacheth Children, Servants, and all Inferiours, Self-willedness, Crossness and Obstinacy, in opposition to the lawful Injunctions of those that are over them; and in downright Contradiction to that Selfdenial, Meekness

ness and Submission, which is so often taught them in the Gospel. For there is no Order or Command whatsoever, but there may be some doubt or dispute, about the Convenience or Fitness of it to be commanded, amongst Persons of weak and scrupulous Minds. And as Mr. *Baxter* saith Truly, *if we must avoid all as Sin, which some good Men have scrupled, we must make Superstition a great part of our Religion.* Our Fonts, Clocks, Hour glasses, Bells, Pulpits, yea and Churchies, and what not, have met with Secretaries of one hand or other, that have quarrell'd with them, and have inveigh'd against all as *Popish*; and have profess'd that they could not come near to Worship there, where the least *Popish* Rag is retain'd. But of this Matter we have said more before, in our Reply to Mr. *Calamy's* Introduction, to which we refer the Reader.

2. His other Discourse, p. 188. is very strange also; for He tells us, That *it having been objected that the Sign of the Cross was appointed to work Grace by way of exciting Signification; we strangely triumph and challenge Him, to name one single Person of any tolerable Understanding for these hundred Tears past that ever so thought or said.* By the way, we had no sly Meaning in mentioning for *these hundred Tears past*, but meant it of any

Prote-

Protestant Writer: But that we made any such Challenge as to the Matter, that He speaks of, we utterly deny. And He must have a great Presumption upon his Reader, that He will take what He saith upon trust, and never consult our *Defence*: For if He doth, He will find our Challenge to relate quite to another Matter. He had told us, in *His 10th Chapter of the Abridgment*, That *though in the Form of words us'd, this Sign of the Cross is said to be in token He shall not be asham'd, yet the generality are apt to understand it, that in vertue and power of this Sign, the Person baptiz'd shall not be asham'd, &c.* It was to this that we said, That so far were the *Generality* from understanding it so, that we challenged Him to name one single Person, &c. And we appeal to all the World, Whether Mr. Hooker or Dr. Comber explain in token (which are the Words that we are to defend) to be meant of in vertue and power: and, Whether we had not good reason to be confident, that no one of tolerable Understanding could mean so; because it requires no more than to understand English, to be sure that in token is quite a different thing from in vertue and power: and all Virtue, Power or Efficacy, or whatever might be thought proper to a Sacrament, are as plainly disclaim'd by the Church in the Ca-

non about it, and by all its Writers, as can be done by Words: And (as it happens) we mention'd properly enough *within an hundred Years past*; because it is about that time since it was declar'd by the *Canon, The Infant baptiz'd is receiv'd, &c. by virtue of Baptism, before it be sign'd by the Sign of the Cross, and not by any power ascribed to the Sign of the Cross.* So that if any Persons had own'd his Sense, they must neither understand Grammar, nor agree to the plain Words of the Churches Explication. How can one trust a Man in representing other's Words, that is evidently guilty of such strange Mistakes?

As to the *Working Grace by exciting Signification*; We made no Challenge about it. We told Him, That Holy Souls may be excited and stirr'd up by any thing. For though we deny'd, that there is any *appointment* for this in the Church; and though we think that some Rhetorical Passages in Writers, as one of them quoted by Him, are not easily explain'd to one, that will list to cavil; yet we doubt not but a Man having receiv'd *his Name* in Baptism (especially if it be a significant Name, as was frequent in the *Jewish Church*, and is us'd by some in our days) may be *excited* and stirr'd up thereby. The Remembrance of the *Book that is kiss'd* in taking

taking an Oath, may excite a Holy Soul in the keeping of his Oath. They were probably *excited* and stirr'd up to Peace and Unity, by the *Kiss of Charity* and *Love-feasts*. And though we find no *appointment* of the Church to use this or like Signs, for any such *exciting* purposes; yet are they apt to administer (objectively) such Thoughts to a pious Soul afterwards; as indeed all the visible Creatures of God are. This is fully set down by Dr. *Whitby*, *Prot. Recon.* part. 2. p. 127. What follows in Mr. *Calamy*, wholly concerns the *Imposers*; and how far our compliance is warrantable with Impositions, we have at large declar'd; so that we shall only add, That whereas we had referr'd Him to Bishop *King's* Account of the Warrant from Scripture to use Professing Signs, apply'd to this Ceremony: He again refers us to Mr. *Boyse* in Answer to Him. Now Bishop *King's* Discourse is well known, containing above 100 Pages about this Matter, in an Appendix to his *Second Admonition*, and has been publish'd these 8 Years. And we have an Account from several Booksellers (one of which printed Mr. *Boyse's* other Books) that they know of no Answer that He has made to that *Second Admonition*, nor do they think there is any, unless it be in *Ireland*.

V. As

Of excluding
from the
Lord's Supper
them that
scruple knee-
ling.

V. As to the lawfulness of *Kneeling* at the Sacrament, we have no Occasion further to contest it: For Mr. Calamy allows it to be lawful in its self, and grants the posture to be indiffer-
rent; and only seems to aim at the unwarrantableness of imposing it. He owns his Argument from *Symbolizing with the Papists* to be strained, if brought to prove it sinful to be us'd. He still indeed insists upon Christ's administering it in a Table-posture, because *John lay in his Bosom*. We shall only refer Him to *Lightfoot on Mat. 26. 6.* compar'd with what is said on *Joh. 13. 23.* where it is plainly prov'd, that *that leaning on his Breast* was not at the Passover-supper, but two days before: And to Bp. *King of Inventions, &c.* Ch. 4. §. 2. for the further proof, that there is no probability of our Lord's administering this ordinance in a Table-posture. And that the Circumstances of time, place, posture, number of Communicants, &c. at that first Administration, were not intended to oblige succeeding Ages, is the general Doctrine of the Nonconformists as well as other Protestants.

But 'tis the making this posture an *exclusive Term of Communion* that the main of the Debate was about. Here we asserted, that the

the *Rubrick* (with which only we are concern'd, as to the matter of *Assent and Consent*) requiring us *to give it to them Kneeling*, is not equivalent *to give it only to such*. He had intimated, that the *Rubrick's* excluding all that did not kneel, was the sense of those *that were upon the Secret* in the Savoy-conference, though the other *Commissioners* thought otherwise. This confirms us by the way, that in things prescrib'd by great Bodies of Men, the several Members might have different Sentiments, though they agree in the main. He owns it was so in this matter amongst the *Commissioners on the Church side*, at the Savoy. And we innocently believ'd (thinking that He had represented a matter of fact true) that we had liberty to be of the Mind of that part of the *Commissioners on the Church side*, who in this matter oppos'd those *that were upon the Secret*: And We can take his Reflections on this account, p. 202. and in other places, and desire to *bind them as a Crown unto us*.

But perhaps all this while Mr. Calamy has led us into a mistake, as to plain matter of fact; and so clear will our sense be, that the *Liturgy* do's not exclude all that *Scruple Kneeling*, that possibly there was never a Doctor at the Savoy but own'd it. If we look to the Book, that Mr. Calamy abridgeth, the

the matter of fact stands thus. *Baxter's Life*, pt. 2. p. 346. In the Conference, Mr. Baxter had argued that *Kneeling at the Sacrament, though lawful, if impos'd by a Penalty, (viz. Non-Communion) incomparably beyond the Proportion of the Offence, becomes per accidens a Sin to the Commander.* Upon this Mr. Baxter saith in the place above-cited, *They fell into discord amongst themselves.* Dr. Pearson who was to defend the Book told us, his Judgment was, that the sense was not exclusive. i. e. (as it is exprest a little before) that the Words of the Common-prayer Book, do only include *Kneelers, but not exclude others.* Dr. Morley, who was to offend the Nonconformists, gave his Judgment for the exclusive Sense, viz. that the Minister is to give it to *Kneelers and no others.* By this we understand what the Secret was. Some were to defend the Book and so were left to their unbiased Judgment; Some were suppos'd by Mr. Baxter to have another part to act, and that was to offend the Nonconformists, and these are said to be in the Secret. And according to this very History our sense is clear; for they who were to defend the Book, and had no secret part to act, did defend our sense, as the genuine Doctrine of the Church. It further appears by the History, that Bp. Morley is the only Man mention'd to be in this secret; though
Mr.

Mr. Calamy for reasons best known to Himself, speaks plurally, *those that were in the secret*, contradicted it, viz. the sense by us given. And yet this one and only Man, afterwards, in a Book entituled, *The Bishop of Worcester's Letter to a Friend*, &c. printed A. 1662. speaking of the Savoy business, p. 16. do's charge Mr. Baxter with a *Falsification*, in pretending the matter in dispute was the imposition of kneeling at the Communion, when, saith He, *this very matter was expressly rejected in the very beginning of the dispute*, as belonging to the Canons not the Common-prayer Book and Mr. Baxter knows that this Argument was deny'd upon that Ground. And if it be said, this seems to be a contradiction to Mr. Baxter's report, as to matter of fact. We think, no. Mr. Baxter calls those wrangling Words which He and the other Commissioners had about this matter, by the Name of a *Dispute*, which name the Bishop will not allow it: But whatever Bp. Morley might in the heat of discourse say, it is plain that his fixed and sedate thoughts were, that *the rejecting them that don't kneel, was no part of the Common-prayer*; or that kneeling is not by the Liturgy made a necessary Term of Communion.

But perhaps it may be objected, that Mr. Calamy's sense of the *Rubrick* is more according to the Common use of Words in other Cases.

Cases. As it hath been urg'd by some,
 " If a **Prince** should Command a Minister
 " of State to dispense Medals to certain of
 " his Subjects, *all meekly kneeling*; who would
 " not think, that He was to deny them, to
 " them that refuse to kneel. To which we
 answer, that this suppos'd Commission to a
 Minister of State is *particular*, and concern-
 ing Him only, and so is not paralld to our
 Case. The *Rubrick* in the Liturgy is not a
 Command to the Minister only, but to the
 People also: And one part of it concerns
the one, and the other *the other*, if then the
 People fail on their part, yet is not the Mi-
 nister prohibited from doing his. And how
 can we understand such a Phrase, but by
 comparing it with other Forms of Speech
 in the same Book, where no such prohibition
 is suppos'd to be imply'd? As is set down
 in our *Defence*, p. 57. For what other or better
 way can there be to find out the sense of an
 Expression in any Author or Book, than to
 compare it with others of the like nature
 commonly us'd in and by the same? So
 after the Absolution, it is said; *The Mini-*
ster shall say the Lords prayer, the People also
kneeling and repeating it with Him. So be-
 fore the Creed; *This is to be said by the*
Minister and People standing. So in the be-
 ginning of the Communion service, and again
 be-

before the *Confession* in that Office, and several other places, where the Expressions and Forms of Speech are the same; which Expressions yet in those places are acknowledg'd only to notifie the Peoples duty, which they are to take notice of; but were never intended to put a bar to the Ministers proceeding, if the people neglect their part, and why in this alone must such a prohibition be imply'd?

But Mr. Calamy tells us, that one of our Brethren owns the hardship of driving away Believers from the Lord's table for Nonconformity to a Rite. *Irenæus junior*, p. 15. But do's this Brother say, that He or we Assented and Consented to it? The hardship ariseth from the Canon (when any such there is) and not from the Liturgy. And here He asks us a pretty question, *Why may not He refer us to the Canon about kneeling, as well as we refer Him to the Canon about the Cross in Baptism?* We answer him plainly, because the Liturgy refers us expressly to the one, to explain the Sense of the Book by it, but do's not at all so, as to the other: And this is that, which makes the wide difference. Then He falls a jesting with us about the Sense of the Church, that we should consent to. It was the Sense of the Convocation, that a penalty should be laid, in this matter (as there

there are many penal Laws made *in terrorem*) but this is nothing to the *Sense of the Church* in compiling a Form of administering the Lord's Supper. We think we have shew'd him the *Sense* of the High Imposers to be for what we say; however we Assent not to their thoughts or private designs, but to what is declar'd to be their *Sense* in the *Book of Common prayer*.

But for all this Mr. Calamy will have it that the *Rubrick* is to be explain'd by the *Canon*. And He takes this way further to prove it. *In the Common prayer Book set forth in K. Edward's time A. 1549. this was a Rule given, as touching kneeling, crossing, holding up the Hands, knocking on the Breast and other gestures, they may be used or left, as every Mans Devotion serveth without Blame. So that in K. Edward's days, People were left at Liberty whether they would kneel at the Communion or not.* How this agrees with the Famous *Rubrick* about the meaning of Kneeling at the Lord's Supper, against the Popish Idolatry, that was in the Book in K. Edward's days, afterwards cast out, and restor'd by the last Review, the World must judge. But He proceeds, *This Rule*, he saith *was afterwards left out, and in Qu. Eliz. time the Rubrick in the Common-prayer ran thus: the Minister — shall deliver it to the People*

in their hands kneeling. This kneeling He owns did concern the People, and saith some were dubious, whether it might not be warrantably and safely wav'd. Then comes the Convocation of 1603. and they make a Canon that concerns the Minister, that no Minister under pain of Suspension should give the Sacrament to any that did not kneel. Lastly come the Revisers of the Liturgy at K. Charles's Restauration, and they took the Rubrick as they found it, varying very little: The Minister shall deliver it to the People in order into their Hands, all meekly kneeling. Now what will Mr. Calamy get by all this? It is plain by his own account, that this Rubrick had reference to the Rubrick in Qu. Elizabeth's time, varying very little from it: And that Rubrick plainly concern'd the People, being (as He would represent it) a Restriction of the Liberty, that He supposeth the People had in K. Edward's days; and if this Rubrick was taken out of that, why do's not this concern the People only, and relate only to them, as that did? But, saith He, The Revisers plainly suppose the Canon to remain in force, and to pass for an Explication. But this is only asserted in Mr. Calamy's usual way, without any proof; They might suppose the Canon to remain in force, but how do's it appear that they took the Canon, for an Explication of the Rubrick?

brick? They took the *Rubrick*, as he owns, from the other *Rubrick*, that concerns the People; and they do not at all refer to the *Canon* for the Explication of it, as they do about the *Cross in Baptism*, to the *Canon* that explains *that*; and as we may well suppose they would have done, if they had intended that this *Rubrick* should be understood according to the tenour of *that Canon*. And whereas He saith, that they who were for our sense in the *Savoy-conference*, were over-ruled by the Major part, who took the *Canon* for an *Explication*; just the Contrary appears to be true; which we hope we have shew'd fully by our considerations on the *History* of that conference, which He took upon Him to *Abridge*. So that we cannot see but that Mr. *Calamy's* discourse in this matter is quite contrary to his purpose, nor can we see any reason, that this *Canon* should pass for an *Explication* of the *Rubrick*, with them that will embody themselves with this *Constitution*, unless He could shew us, that the *Constitution* hath so determin'd it. He asserts indeed, that this is a part of the *Uniformity* which it was the Design of the Law to establish: But what This do's He mean? The *Liturgy* only is the Rule of that *Uniformity*, which the *Act* therefore has establish'd. Has that *Act* made the *Canon* a part of the *Liturgy*?

Liturgy? Or is any reference made to it therein?

But, He saith, *the sense of the Church requires kneeling, and this kneeling required by the Church is one of the Rites and Ceremonies assented and consented to.* Well, and what follows from all this? *Then must the Declaration and Subscription made in compliance with the Act for Uniformity, be an agreement to exclude such as refuse kneeling.* Hold, Sir, a little; if you had infer'd *thus*; Then must the Declaration and Subscription in compliance with the Act for uniformity be an Agreement to the Observation of the Rites enjoyn'd, and kneeling in particular, and so for every one in this matter to do his own duty; this had been a fair Inference. But do's the Act of Uniformity any where make it our Duty, to exclude such as refuse kneeling? Do's our Subscription and Declaration in compliance with the Act of Uniformity engage us to that, which is no where in it? We are altogether at a loss about such Reasoning.

It is true, Circumstances may be imagin'd in which the Canon may bear hard upon a Minister, who dares not exclude such a Scrupulous Person. If such a Case should possibly happen, He must consider and compare all things together before He expose himself

himself to the danger of Suspension: and this Mr. Calamy calls *trifling*. So that *weighing of things, Consideration, consulting the Bishop &c.* when He is like to be in danger of Suspension, is *Trifling* in his account. But if to to talk at this Rate be not worse than *Trifling*, we know not what is.

VI. We come next to the Rubrick about the 3 Orders of Ministry. And here we must own that we have committed a Mistake, and have granted more than we should have done, when we say, That by the Declaration we own an Allowance of those distinct Orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons *from the Apostles Time*. This is indeed agreeable to our own inward Sense, as to the matter of Fact (so far as we are acquainted with History) that (at least) in many Churches these 3 Orders were from the Apostles Time: It is also agreeable to Mr. Baxter's Sense, as appears by the places cited from Him, in our *Defence*, and we could produce several more. It is true the places cited do only expressly prove the Difference between *Bishops* and *Presbyters*,; and therefore Mr. Calamy saith, p. 210. He cannot see that to be a proof of 3 Orders. However, we could not but take it to be a plain Answer to Him, who had made his Objection against the 3 Orders,

Orders, because *Bishops* and *Presbyters* were all one: it being no part of the Controversy; but that, if they were two Orders, then *Deacons* were a third; nor has He said any thing here to disprove it. But all that the *Declaration* is concern'd with in this Matter, is, the Allowance of these Orders, and the manner of their Ordination and Consecration by this Book; as we expressly explain our selves in our Defence, p. 59. And whereas He saith, p. 211. that He desires it may be observ'd that Mr. Ollyffe owns that All must by Assent and Consent own 3 Orders from the Apostles days. I desire that it may be observ'd, that though I do believe the matter of fact to be true, yet I do retract the Slip or Mistake in saying, That by Assent and Consent this is to be own'd, for what the Assent and Consent refers to, is the Form of Ordination and Consecration, and not the Assertion in the Rubrick. To this He makes no new Reply, only to a casual passage, concerning which He saith, p. 210. That to come off at last with confounding Order and Degree, between which the Learned World hath all along distinguish'd, hath no good face. But pray, Sir, what do you mean by this? if you had better explain'd your self, we should have been better able to make a Judgment of your Candor therein. And I pray, Sir, with what face do you say the same thing, p. 216. Thus far

I agree, say you, let it but be prov'd that Bishops, Priests and Deacons had the distinct Powers now assign'd them by the Church, and if any afterwards cavil about the term that should be given them, and whether they shall be call'd 3 Orders, Offices, or Degrees, they are needlessly litigious. We doubt not but some of the Learned World have often confounded the rest of the World with Distinctions without Differences.

The Proposition of this Rubrick is form'd or exprest with as great a Latitude and Moderation, as could ever be expected from an Episcopal Church; it saith nothing of *Divine Right* or Appointment; that is his Addition, as Mr. *Hoadly* well observes: it saith nothing of the Distinction of their Powers and Offices, or the difference that is between them; or whether they have every where been in every Church or no: But only that *from the Apostles Times, there have been these Orders of Ministers in the Church of Christ, Bishops, Priests and Deacons*; from which the most that can be infer'd, is, That in such Churches, where there has been need of them, or occasion for them all, there have been 3 such Ranks of Ministers for the Instruction and Government of *Christ's Church*, from the Times of the Apostles: Which yet, by Mr. *Calamy's* Leave, do's not prove a *Divine Appointment* of all (however other-
wise

wise it may appear to Him) there having been other things in the Apostles Days which yet are allow'd for all that, not to have been of *Divine Appointment*. It is the Superiority and Subordination of Officers for the convenient and orderly Government and Edification of the Church, according to the Exigency of Places, that Episcopal Men have been concern'd to maintain; whatever Name or Names in general they have been express'd by; whether Ranks, Orders, Offices or Degrees; it being a matter of no moment (as he Himself has confess'd, *p. 216.* though in contradiction to what He saith, *p. 210.*) by what Names or Appellations they are call'd, in which they have had their different Notions. And we are verily perswaded that whosoever shall own such Distinction of Orders, Offices, or Degrees in the Church; and shall humbly submit to the Government and godly Directions of his Superiours in all lawful and honest things, shall abundantly satisfy the Fathers and Governours of the Church, by such his Submission and Assent; without nicely determining or troubling Himself about the Controversies concerning these Names, wherein many Learned and Worthy Men do differ one from another. It being sufficient in this case to answer our Subscription in the utmost stretch, and the

most comprehensive meaning of it, that there is nothing in this matter *contrary to the Word of God*; as we verily believe there is not: and it is no *Sign that we are put to our shifts herein*; when we are not oblig'd on any account whatsoever to assert any more.

But yet we will not be laugh'd out of the using of Scripture for the explaining of these Terms neither; but we will give him another Text for it, wherein the Order of a Presbyter is call'd *A Degree*, as distinct from a Deacon, 1 Tim. 3. 13. *They that have us'd the Office of a Deacon well, purchase to themselves a good Degree, [or, higher Office in the Church] as Dr. Whitby paraphraseth it, noting upon that place thus; It being the Custom to chuse Presbyters out of the Deacons, and Bishops out of the best Presbyters; and therefore at his Ordination they pray'd, That He using the Office of a Deacon unblameably might* *αξιωδὴναι βαδίζει*, *be held worthy of a higher Degree, Const. Apost. l. 8. ch. 18.* And yet the difference between a Deacon and a Presbyter Mr. Calamy will believe, to be greater than that between a Presbyter and a Bishop. And if a Presbyter may be express'd by the Name or Term of *A Degree* above a Deacon, well then may the Office of a Bishop above a Presbyter be express'd by the same Term or Name.

We

We had moreover in our *Defence* put this Question, Whether Bishops and Presbyters may not be the *same Order* in one respect, and *different Orders* in another respect? The Bishops being the *same Order* in Preaching and Administration of Sacraments; but *another Order* in Acts of Jurisdiction, Ordination, &c. As we read of the *Order of Aaron*, in which respect all the Priests, as distinct from the *Levites*, were *one Order*: yet with respect to Jurisdiction, there were *First and Second Orders* of the Priests themselves, as we read of the *Priests of the Second Order*, 2 Kings 13. 4. to which passages Mr. Calamy doth not vouchsafe to make the least Reply; but only answers our Question in the negative, That *No, by no means* it can't be so, *as far as He can judge*; and gives us this Reason for his Denyal, *because they* both Bishops and Presbyters *act by the same Commission*. But, Sir, if you had confirm'd your Reason, it had been more to the purpose, and we should better have understood the Reason of your *Judgment*: But you neither do here, nor we believe can prove, that there hath been no Superiority of Commission granted to some above others in the Government of the Church; but we believe, we can prove the contrary, if this were a proper place for it, and our Subscription were concern'd therein. And yet if for Argument sake, this should be suppos'd,
That

That they *act by the same Commission*; will you say that this *Commission* may not be restrain'd in the exercise of it by order of a National Church, or agreement of Pastors among themselves? And then, why may not those, to whom larger Powers are committed in the Act or Exercise of them, be well look'd upon as a Superiour Order or Degree to those, that are restrain'd in the use thereof, for certain Order sake, though in their Original Commission they receiv'd the same sort of Powers?

Mr. *Baxter* in both those places cited (however He would shift them off) saith that *Christ* settled a Superiour Rank of Ministers, appointing them besides their Extraordinaries, the work of gathering and overseeing many Churches. So that this according to Mr. *Baxter*, was an Ordinary work belonging to their Office as Apostolical General Bishops, as He calls them, and no part of their Extraordinaries. And he thinks, That they that should go about to assert, that *this Rank and Imparity was revers'd by Him*, will be hard put to it to prove it: And that they ought not without proof to charge *Christ* with seeming Levity and Mutability, as settling a Form of Ministry or Government, which He would have continue but one Age. And in the 2d place quoted, He saith, *It is plain that Christ did* set

set 12 above 70, and kept up the number by Matthias: and gave Power to the Apostles, and they to others, to be exercis'd over other Churches and Pastors. It seems as plain as words can make it, that Mr. Baxter was of opinion, that our Saviour himself did settle (and so according to Him it was by Divine Appointment too) an Order or Rank of Governing Bishops over inferiour Presbyters, as an ordinary and standing Office in the Church. But Mr. Calamy either could not, or would not see the full import of Mr. Baxter's words.

VII. We come next to the Office of Burial. Here Mr. Calamy begins with a long Harangue, for almost a side together, about a Pound, an Ecclesiastical Pound, and Enclosures, and an High-rail, and a Door belonging to it: ('tis a wonder He did not think of a Padlock too) and that all we poor Conformists are in this Pound; but that He for his part loveth his Liberty too well to be brought into it; as all stragling Cattel use to do. Why, but in good earnest, what is the matter? Why, we subscribe and give our Assent and Consent to a Form for the Burying the Dead, to be us'd as to those to whom it do's of right belong: and He would fain have us believe that we ought to use it, as to those to whom it do's not belong

Of some Passages in the Office of Burial.

belong. We don't see that the *Pound* is made by the Church, it is only made by Him; He puts us in, in his own phancy, and then laughs and jeers at us. He saith *p. 220. We commend the Office, and then say, We are not consn'd to it, and He knows not were to find us.* Now this is strange! We do indeed commend the Office as excellent and useful, when rightly apply'd; and so, and so only, we assent and consent to it. But as it is capable of a *wrong Application*, we wish it mended; and affirm, That nothing in the Liturgy or our Assent to it, obligeth us to use it in any cases, where it is not applicable. This we grounded on two things.

1. That the Exception of three sorts of Persons, with respect to whom it is not to be us'd, do's not imply that it must be us'd for all others. Now what is not in the Liturgy, cannot be assented to by our Assent to the Liturgy. Yes, but He saith, *The Rubrick by putting in that Exception of the Unbaptiz'd, Excommunicate and Self-murderers confirms a Prescription in all other cases.* This He saith, but He should have done well to have prov'd it too. Another Rubrick requires us to exclude from the Lord's Supper *all notorious evil-livers, &c.* Do's this confirm a Prescription, that we must receive Persons unbaptiz'd, yea or grossly ignorant, if they

are

are of sober Lives? This Rubrick indeed do's plainly forbid the Form of Burial to be us'd as to those Persons, because the case is most clear, it do's not belong to them (taking it to be meant of Infidels and Contemnners of Baptism, Jews, Mahometans and others out of the Church, &c.) and the Church by this Prohibition design'd to cast a mark of Disgrace upon them. But for others, with respect to whom the case may not be so plain, nor the Description of them in a Rubrick so easy; We cannot perceive, but that the Church leaves a room or scope for the Ministers Discretion; though He asserts, but do's not prove, the contrary.

¶ 2. That one of these three sorts of Persons (there by Name excepted) are those very Persons, that we would exclude; and that He thinks are included in it. Here we gave the Judgment of the Dean of Paul's, back'd with Reasons to prove, *That notorious evil-livers being Excommunicate, ipso facto, though the Sentence be not pronounc'd by an Ecclesiastical Judge, are excluded hereby.* To this He saith, p. 223. *To the Judgment of this Dean, whom He cites in this case, I oppose not only the Canon, but the Judgment of two great Persons, who were successively Archbishops.* Now as to the latter, it is only a private Story, that two Persons of Worth are said to report
from

from Archbishop *Tillotson*. Who ever will consider how He has represented the *Discourse* of the Commissioners of the *Savoy* about Kneeling; and our *Challenge* about the Cross in Baptism (though here He had or might have the Books before Him) will not think we are bound to believe, that there is all Exactness us'd in a Report of a Casual Discourse betwixt two Friends, deliver'd only from hand to hand, where a word added or taken away from Archbishop *Sancroft's* Answer might give a different Turn to the whole. They must be little acquainted with the too frequent manner of telling Stories, and repeating other Mens Words, that can think that any thing can be gather'd from such Relations. But to take the Story as it lyes, and supposing that Mr. *Calamy* tells it exactly, as the two Gentlemen told it Him; and that the two Gentlemen told it, as Bishop *Tillotson* told it them: what do's it all amount to? Do either of those two Archbishops oppose what the *Dean* had said, or what we had said from Him? As to what Archbishop *Tillotson* saith, we fully agree with Him, let him make his most of it. He is there said to have own'd, That the *Dissenters* had some plausible Objections against some parts of the Common prayer; and this about the Office for Burial for one. Some plausible Objections, or
 else

else truly Mr. Calamy and others have made a fine stir about nothing: but did that Great Man say, That these Objections were *solid and unanswerable*, and that particularly about this Office? How came He then to subscribe and Assent to the use of it? No, we may be confident, this was not the matter. But that most Judicious and Excellent Person, we all know, was mightily for Moderation, and for making all reasonable Concessions and Abatements, in order to Accommodation for the publick Peace; and the *Plausibility* of the Objections that are made, is indeed a good Argument for that: but it is no Argument at all against our Subscription and Assent, when we are perswaded, they are *plausible* only, and have in them only an appearance, but not any true weight. As to Archbishop *Sancroft's* Words, they could not be understood, That *He was not satisfy'd with the Office of Burial*, as to the lawfulness of its use, so far as it is prescrib'd, For He had often subscrib'd to it, *That it might lawfully be us'd*; but that He thought there might be difficulty sometimes about the Application of it, and therefore that He had not taken a *Pastoral Charge for that Reason*. So that this must only respect the Inconvenience, that He thought He might be put to by the Canon; or by the noise and quarrels of Relations

lations (in some places) where the Persons to be buried are excluded: which yet, we believe, by a prudent use of such a part of the Office, as is not subject to that Inconvenience (where we are not bound to use it at all) may be prevented.

Then as to the *Canon*, it is plain, it is no part of the Liturgy to which we assent, nor do's the Liturgy ever refer thereunto. To this Mr. Calamy saith, that this shews the *Sense of the Church*, and we must consent to the Liturgy in the *Churches sense*. To this we say, it do's not in the least appear, that it was the *Sense of the Church*, that this *Canon* should explain the *Liturgy*, or our Agreement to it: But the *Sense of the Convocation* was, that such a penal Law might be added over and above, to be made use of, by the Government, when there should be Occasion. And so prudently has the Government managed themselves, that we do not know any one instance of the most conscientious of the Old Puritans or present Conformists, that ever has received any damage from this *Canon*, for these hundred Years past; nor do we think it likely that any will, though we grant it possible that they may. Nor do we *Act unfairly* (as He with his usual Candour insinuates, p. 221.) in our *Submission to the Constitution*, and then waving this Office in the
Cases

Cases not excepted. For not only have we prov'd, that the *Case* we are upon, is *excepted*; but even as to the *Canon*, we are ready to submit thereunto, according to the Limitations set down by Himself, p. 337. for the understanding of the *Canons*; as we shall fully declare when we come to speak of them. But if a Corps be offer'd, over which a Minister is not satisfy'd to use the Office, and so *rides out of Town*, to avoid any noise or clamour about it; how do's *He ride away from his compliance with his Subscription*, which He never made to such an use of it?

As to the *softning words* (as He calls them) which we us'd, we thought them proper; that we might shew how *hardly* He had dealt with several of the passages in the Office; and that it might not be presum'd that we had thought his explication of those passages true. But we did not insist upon them, but return'd to our first Answer, because we own'd *The Office* (in those parts of it) *might in some Cases be lyable to be abus'd*, and therefore insist'd upon it, that *in those Cases it was not requir'd to be us'd*; and we ended with two things. 1. That the constant and acknowledg'd *Doctrine* of the Church shews the *Sense* of the Compilers of this Form, and that they had no ill design therein. 2. That

P

the

the requir'd and promis'd *Discipline* of the Church is to prevent the *Abuse*. By which we meant (as we expressly said) the *Discipline* which every Minister has promis'd to administer, viz. In the enquiring into the state of his Flock, particularly in their Sickness, what Repentance they have manifested, &c. which the *Dean* also directly refer'd to. And what Mr. *Hoadly* has so well advanc'd concerning the Actings of some High Men, in his *pt. 1. p. 120.* who have refus'd to bury the Dissenters by this Office, confirms it, that *their Sense* of the *Rubrick* (which Mr. *Calamy* always manifests a high esteem for) is very agreeable to *Ours* in this matter: though what we plead for, is more expressly conformable to the Law; because the Law now forbids the Excommunicating of them that they reject, but requires and commands the Excommunication of those whom we reject.

In short, there needs no more to be said in this matter, but only this; that we give our Assent and Consent to this Office in the proper application of it, that is, when it ought to be us'd; viz. When there is some lesser degree (at least) or ground of *Hope* of our Brother's resting in Christ, according to the Expression in the last Collect. For if we have such *Hope*, we may surely express that

Hope,

Hope, and may in other things express our selves suitably to it. And it is more agreeable to the Spirit of Christianity, and to the Temper of the Church to exceed in the Charitable, rather than in the Uncharitable and Censorious side. And this is what must be premis'd as necessary to the use of this Office, that we have *some hope*, though perhaps on the other side we have *some Fears*. For we are not bound to express our *Fears*, when we may express our *Hopes*. For what have we to do to judge our Brother, without the greatest and most apparent Evidence, which in this case is not suppos'd?

But if any be a notorious and profligate Sinner, or dieth in the commission of any great and notorious Sin; without any time for, or sign of Repentance; it is most certain that this Office is not intended for such a one: and those passages (at least) ought to be left out, which express such Hope concerning Him, when there is no Hope. If the Discipline and Censures of the Church ought to have been executed upon a notorious Sinner, if there had been Life and Time for it; He ought to be had in the same condition with one that is actually excommunicated. And if this Office ought not to be perform'd at the Interment of a Person that is excommunicated, it ought not certainly

to be at the Interment of one that plainly and evidently deserves to be so, for the same reason. For the *Offices of the Church* ought in all reason to be explain'd consistently with the *Doctrine of the Church*. And as for the Doctrine of the Church, it is agreed on all hands in this matter, to be most Orthodox; and doth as little favour profligate Sinners in their vain Hopes; and as little encourage Presumption and Impenitence, as any whatsoever.

Something is to this end, to be observ'd about the difference of the Expression of *Hope*, in the *Collect* which respects the Person of the Deceas'd; and that other of *Sure and Certain Hope of the Resurrection to Eternal Life* at the Interment. In the *Collect* it is barely *Hope*, that is express'd; which may be, though of a lesser degree, so the Expression is calculated for more general use. But at the *Interment*, it is, *Sure and Certain Hope of the Resurrection to Eternal Life*; which the Church cannot possibly intend with respect to every Person, concerning whom there may be but a lesser degree of Hope: and therefore that *Sure and Certain Hope* must certainly be meant of the *Article of the Resurrection* only; or of *our own Resurrection*, as it follows immediately, ——— *through Jesus Christ our Lord, who shall change our vile Bodies,*

Bodies, &c. and has no respect to the Person of the Deceas'd, because it cannot be true of every Person: there may be *some Hope*, though not *Sure and Certain Hope*.

VIII. We come now to *the Rule about Easter*. And we will not stick to own, That we did not state the matter with that Evidence and Clearness that we should have done. But I must inform the World, that I sent a Letter to Mr. Calamy afterwards particularly about this Business, which I have reason to believe that he receiv'd, which he was desir'd to accept of as a more perfect Answer; but He has not thought fit (though desir'd) to take any notice of it. It is the only thing (as to the Substance of our Defence) that after two Year's time for us to review, and for Mr. Calamy to pick holes in, that we find our selves short and mistaken in. The truth is, we all along took the *Objection* for a *Trifle*, and are more and more perswaded, that our *Assent and Consent* is not concern'd therein. We distinguish between the *Prescription* design'd by the Rule, and the *Assertion* made therein concerning it. The *Prescription* or thing intended to be prescrib'd, is the finding out of *Easter*, in order to the observing of it: and both Mr. Calamy's Limitations about our Rule of Interpretation, p. 103. are here very futable. 1. That the

end of the Law is mainly to be regarded.
 2. And that the Sense of the Legislators be taken in. Now there is no doubt about what day they intended to *prescribe*: the Design is to prescribe *Easter-day*, and that very Day that we keep. This being the acknowledg'd Design, or *thing intended to be prescrib'd*, we do *Assent and Consent* to what is *prescrib'd*. But as to what the Rule *asserts* or avoucheth, that *Easter-day is always, &c.* this is no part of what we are to *assent* to: it is an *Assertion* or *Proposition*, and no *Prescription* or *Injunction*.

Yet cannot we see but the *Assertion* has a very good and true Meaning, if it be rightly taken and understood. The *Common-Prayer Book* in the *Calendar*, gives us a *Method* for the finding out the *New and Full Moons*, and also this Rule to find out *Easter*, *That Easter-day is always the first Sunday after the first Full Moon that happens next after March 21. viz.* according to the *Method* afore-said for finding out of *New and Full Moons* in the *Calendar*. But, saith *Mr. Calamy*, the *Method* for finding out of the *New and Full Moons* is not right according to the *Moon* in the *Heavens*, and according to the *common Almanacks*. We answer, It is according to the old way of finding out the *New and Full Moons*, *viz.* by the *Golden Number*:
 And

And here it must be observ'd, that there is no *Affertion* in the Book, about this *Method* us'd therein, for the finding the New and Full Moons, that it is *always* right and exact; but only that according to the Computation which is there made, *Easter-day* is *always* the *first Sunday after the first full Moon*, &c. which, according to the utmost Observation that we can make, is very true. And we are the rather inclin'd to think that, according to the establish'd Computation of New Moons by the *Golden Number*, this Rule for finding *Easter* will never fail; because the other Rule just after the Calendar in the Liturgy (against which there is no Objection) do's proceed also by the *Golden Number*.

For the sake of those that understand it not, we shall distinctly set down the way of finding out *Easter-day* by this Rule.

In the Calendar of Months in the Liturgy, in the first Column before the Days of the Month, you find a Series of Figures not exceeding xix (plac'd even with certain Days in every Month) each of which signifies the *Golden Number* for the proper Year: *E. g.*

In January	2	} be- fore the	{	1 Day,
you find	10			3 Day,
	19			5 Day, and so on.

Each of which Numbers is a Mark to find out the Day of the Month in which the New Moon

Moon is (according to the Antient Account) for that Year in which the said Figure is the Golden Number. *E.g.* If 2 be the Golden Number, the New Moon is *January 1*; if 10, the New Moon is *Jan. 3*; if 19, the New Moon is *Jan. 5*. and so on. Now according to this way of finding out the New Moons (which whether always exact, according to the Moon in the Heavens, is not said) *Easter-day is always the first Sunday after the first Full Moon, &c.* The Reasons why they reckon'd the Moons by the Golden Number, must be learnt from *Astronomers*: something is readily seen in *Collier's Dictionary*, under the Articles *Golden Number* and *Cycle of the Moon*. It is enough for us, that according to this way of finding New Moons (expressly refer'd to in the Liturgy) the Rule is very good and exact; as we shall shew him by a Table of the same Years that He sets down, continued to this present year.

Tears.

of Ministerial Conformity. 217

Years.	Golden number for each Year.	It's place in the Calendar noting the new Moons.	Full Moon being 14 days after inclusive.	Sunday after known by the Dom. Letter is Easter day.
1694	4	March 20.	April 2.	G. April 8.
1695	5	March 9.	March 22.	F. Mar. 24.
1696	6	March 28.	April 10.	E. D. Apr. 12.
1697	7	March 17.	March 30.	C. Apr. 4.
1698	8	April 5.	April 18.	B. Apr. 24.
1699	9	March 25.	April 7.	A. Apr. 9.
1700	10	March 14.	March 27.	G. F. Mar. 31.
1701	11	April 2.	April 15.	E. Apr. 20.
1702	12	March 22.	April 4.	D. Apr. 5.
1703	13	March 11.	March 24.	C. Mar. 28.
1704	14	March 30.	April 12.	B. A. Apr. 16.

The Reader will further observe from this Table another remarkable difference between these Ecclesiastical Full Moons, and the Full Moons in the Almanack (which further shews that the Almanacks can never be suited to the explaining this Rule) and that is, that the Full Moons according to the Rule must always be on the 14th. day of the Moon inclusive (whereas the Full Moons in the Almanack are seldom or never before the 15th. day, and very often on the 16th.) and the reason of this is, because the Jewish passover was order'd on the 14th. day of the first Month, *Exod.* 12. 6. Hence some Christians in the primitive times, in Imitation of the *Jews*, would Celebrate the Feast of *Easter* on the 14th. day of the Moon, what day of the Week so ever it hapned; these were

were call'd *Quartodecimani*: What a dispute this made is well known. Now the History tells us thus, that, *A. 335.* This dispute was entirely terminated in the Council of Nice, which order'd. 1. that the Festival of Easter should not be celebrated till after the Vernal Equinox. 2. that the Vernal Equinox should be fixed to the 21th. of March. 3. that that Sunday should always be pitch'd upon, which followed immediately the 14th. of the Moon. 4. that if the 14th. day of the Moon hapned to be on a Sunday, it should be defer'd till the next Sunday following, that Easter might not be celebrated by them the same day as by the Jews, see *Colliers Dictionary* under the word (*Quartodecimani*).

Now then what becomes of Mr. Calamy's Triumph, that there is no dependance upon this Rule, that it is very unfit to be laid down as a Rule by a Church that lays so much stress on Uniformity, and because its Language is no longer intelligible? We believe it is intelligible, and that we have plainly shew'd it to be so; and it is very likely, that Mr. Calamy himself doth understand it. Well, but however, He is for standing by the Moon in the Heavens, and let the Moon in the Calendar shift for it self: And He is so well pleas'd with this Jest, that 6 Lines after He repeats it again, *E'en then, let it be so; we do not advise him to have recourse to this Computation*

tation, to let Blood or to take Physick by: But yet this Computation serves for that end, for which it is design'd as well as a better, and always will do so, for any thing we can know to the contrary. And when a means doth readily answer the end that it was design'd for, it is not so contemptible as He would make it.

IX. We come now to his dispute about the *Apocryphal Lessons*. ^{Of the use of Apocryphal Lessons.} Here he objects against two things,

I. *Against the wording of the Rubrick, that (as He apprehends) makes the Apocryphal Writings to go under the Name of Holy Scriptures.* To this we answer'd, that supposing that it did so, it is no more, than what is common in all Speech for the lesser and meaner to go under the Denomination of the greater and better part. This answer, He saith doth not savour of that peculiar respect to the Holy Scriptures, as He should have expected, from a Man of Mr. Ollyffe's Character. Why, what is the matter? Doth Mr. Ollyffe say here, that the Apocryphal Books are Canonical, or that they are part of the Holy Scriptures? Nay do not his words imply the quite contrary, when He intimates that they are lesser and meaner than they; which certainly He would not have said, if he had thought them divinely in-

inspir'd, as He believes the Holy Scriptures are! But I have ever now and then such a cast of Mr. Calamy's Candour and Charity, which if He had pleas'd, He might well have spar'd. Yet He *allows our Rule in things of the same kind, but not in things of different kinds*: Which distinction we cannot tell, how he can apply to the Rule at all: And we see not what objection can be against a Rule, that takes place so frequently. To instance only in the *Books* and things we are speaking of. We call one of them, the *Book of Common-prayer*, yet do's it comprehend a Calendar and a Preface; and we believe no one will insist upon it, that the Calendar and Prefaces are *Prayers*, because the whole go's under the Name of the *greater part*. So the other Book is call'd the *Holy Bible*, yet do's it contain several Books mark't *Apocrypha* on every Leaf. Now if this be the common way of speaking even with respect to this very thing, why must an order to read the *Holy Scriptures*, be suppos'd to call the *Apocryphal* Writings by that name? Especially when the same Persons who both made and use the *Order*, did make and do use the *Article*, in which these Books are expressly distinguished from the *Holy Scriptures*. And to imagine those Holy Martyrs, and Eminent Persons to *act inconsistently with themselves*

selves, as He saith, p. 252. to count these to be *Holy Scriptures* in a *Rubrick*, and at the same time to declare the contrary in an *Article*, is uncharitable and unreasonable in the highest degree. It is strange! But so it is; this Man would have *the Sense* of the Lawgivers to be our *Rule*, when they never declare it; and yet will not allow it at another time, when they make the most express Declaration of it. He would tie us up to the *Sense of the Church*, (as He calls it) when it is only guess'd by the *Temper* and *Spirit* of the Imposers, *i. e.* his own *evil Surmising*; but He will not allow us to take their *Sense*; when they do most vehemently inculcate it. If this be not to *use divers Weights and Measures*, we know not what is, one of these two things must necessarily be said, that either the *Holy Scriptures* in the Title and Preface to the Calendar, being the far greater part, are to give the Denomination to the whole (as we have said) though there are some *Apocryphal Lessons* Subjoyn'd, which are not part of the *Holy Scriptures*, being not taken out of the Canonical Books: or else the *Holy Scriptures* in the Title and Preface are not to be understood in strict propriety, but in a greater Latitude of Speech, to signifie such Books or Lessons, as are some way useful for *Holy*
in-

Instruction. For it is most evident by the 6th Article, where there is a greater exactness of Speech us'd than there need be in the Title of a Calendar, that the *Apocrypha* are disclaim'd from being any part of the *Inspired Canonical Writings*. And therefore the Calendar, which contains the Apocryphal Lessons cannot possibly be suppos'd with any judgment, to be a Determination or Declaration of what is Canonical Scripture, but (at most) a Direction for what is to be read. And therefore it is most unjust either from this Calendar, or from the Title or Preface to it, to argue that the Church reads *Apocrypha* under the notion of *Holy Scripture* properly so call'd, that is, of Canonical and inspir'd Writings; or that it holds them in equal value with them; when in the aforesaid Article it hath with the greatest exactness of Speech plainly asserted and determin'd the contrary. His other Objection is,

2. *Against the Order to read them in the Churches.* To this we answer'd two things. The one was, That it is very doubtful, Whether there be any such Order, or no. For if the Order be only to read the *Holy Scriptures*, and these are expressly excluded from that Name (both which are evidently true) then the bare being in the Calendar and Table is

no plain Injunction or Signification of the Mind of the Legislators, that they should be read. And it was in the Proof of this that we alledg'd the *Preface to the Homilies*. To which He answers that we are ty'd up since that *Preface by the 14th Canon*: and yet that saith but the same thing, that we must observe the Order of Reading the *Holy Scriptures* prescrib'd in the *Book of Common prayer*, which neither implies the reading the *Apocrypha*, nor any ways contradicts the *Preface*: For if the *Holy Scriptures* in the Title of the *Calendar* be intended to mean the same with the *Holy Scriptures* mention'd in the 6th *Article*, then the *Apocryphal* Lessons are excluded from being read altogether: for the *Holy Scriptures* in the *Article* are distinguish'd from the *Apocrypha*, and are intended by that Distinction to signify only the *Canonical Books*. And all this while He mistakes the Reason, Why we produc'd the *Preface to the Homilies*, which was only to shew what was the Mind of the first Compilers of this Order: For if they thought that Ministers were not constantly bound to the *Calendar* (as it is plain, by the *Preface to the Homilies*, they did) then they might never intend that their Orders to read the *Holy Scriptures* should extend any further than they had declar'd in the *Article*, to be the meaning of that

that word. To this agrees the Judgment of Bishop King (that He may have a late Authority to be joyn'd to the old *Preface*) *Disc. of Inventions, &c. Ch. 3. Sect. 2.* where speaking of some Chapters of the Old Testament left out of the Order, He observes, *That those that are left out are either Genealogies, Names of Persons and Places, Historical Repetitions, or some Obscure and Mystical Prophecies in Ezechiel; and adds, Yet these are not excluded, though not particularly commanded. The general Obligation on every Clergyman in his Ordination to read all the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, still allows Him to read these; and also obligeth Him to it, when it may be for the Edification of the People.*

Yet the other thing that we answer'd was, That supposing the *Order* be to read these Books, we may safely agree to comply therewith. Not that the *Apocrypha* are to be read *in the room* of Holy Scriptures, if by *in the room* be meant that they are read *as Holy Scriptures*, i. e. *as* being such in the most proper sense; for so it is plain, that they are declar'd not to be. But if by *in the room* of Holy Scriptures be only meant that *Apocryphal* Lessons are sometimes read, when Lessons out of the Holy Scriptures might be read, as they are for the most part of the

Year

Year besides: Then the Question will turn upon this, Whether some particular Week Days, or Holy Days that fall upon Week Days, when it is not necessary by any Divine Command, either directly or indirectly, that any part of the Holy Scriptures should be read in the Churches, nothing should be read at all there, but the holy Scriptures of the Canonical Books? Now where is the Divine Order, Command, or Injunction for this? or what, or where is the Transgression, if it be otherwise? We do very heartily own every part and parcel of the Canonical Scriptures to be useful in its place; but can it be prov'd that every part and parcel of it, was intended to be read in all Ages, in the publick Assemblies? or that nothing else must be read? and if the *Apocrypha* may be for some pious use, then it may be turn'd to that use: and though it were to be wish'd that those Lessons out of the *Apocrypha*, which are of less use, might be chang'd, yet there are none but have some certain use. The most feign'd Stories, Parables, and Allegories may have their Use, though not equal to other forms or ways, of speaking, which contain in them more plain and direct Instructions. To strengthen this our Answer, we shall further urge to Mr. Calamy his Subscription, and then answer his Cavil.

It is plain under another Head, How the pinching Him with his own Subscriptions do's anger him: And we fear He will be angry, if in never so loving a manner we shew the World, how closely He will squeeze us in our Subscription and Declaration, and how loosely He ties the Cord as to his own. When we told Him, that by subscribing the 6th Article, He approves the reading of these Books; He tells us, p. 249. *'Tis one thing for the Church to read Apocryphal Books, and another thing to appoint and approve the reading them in the Church. The Church may read them, i.e. allow of the private reading them amongst her Members.* But what Rule can He lay down according to which He makes this Exposition? If what he saith be true, That the Reading these Books in our Churches be prescrib'd, then have we the Sense of the Legislators in this Article more than imply'd: And if no body must speak of the Sense of the Church but Himself; yet how will He bring the Words, in any tolerable manner, to agree with his Sense? what parallel Instance can He bring, that the Church reads, and the Church allows her Members privately to read, should be terms of the same Signification? of what use is the Limitation, that the Church should not use them in applying any Doctrine, if it be only a Pri-

vate

uate reading that is here meant? But above all, how do's his Exposition agree with the Church's reading them, as St. Hierom saith? Would it be worth while to quote St. Hierom, to prove that Men may read these Books as they do *Virgil* and *Horace* in their Chambers? Would not this be a meaner Quotation than his was who said, *Pax est bona res*, as saith St. Austin? It is plain that St. Hierom speaks of the Church's reading them by her Officers in the Church-assemblies, both by the end which He sets down, viz, *The Edification of the Common People* under the Limitation exprest; and also by enumerating the particular Books, which are elsewhere by Name said to be read in the Churches, and therefore are call'd *Libri Ecclesiastici* (as one of them go's by that Name still) when others are excluded from being read by them (as they are left out of our Calendar) though even those might have been read *privately*. We shall set down the words, and leave the Reader to judge touching his Interpretation of what Himself (we suppose) has subscrib'd. *Hieron. Tom. 3. in præf. in lib. Solomonis. Sicut Judith, Tobie, & Machabæorum libros legit quidam Ecclesia, sed eos inter Canonicas Scripturas non recipit; sic & hæc duo volumina (sc. Ecclesiasticum & librum Sapientie) legat ad edificationem Plebis, non ad auctoritatem Ec-*

cleasticorum dogmatum confirmandam. Let this be compar'd with another Passage in *Symbolo Ruffini*, bound up with *St. Hierom's Works*. Where there is a Distinction of Three sorts of Books: some call'd *Canonici*. *Alti libri non sunt Canonici sed Ecclesiastici à majoribus appellati; i. e. Sapientia & Ecclesiasticus, Tobia, Judith, & Machabæorum libri* — *et quæ omnia legi in Ecclesiis voluerunt non tamen proferri ad authoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam. Cate-ras verò Scripturas Apocryphas nominarunt, quas in Ecclesiis legi voluerunt.*

Here He presseth us with the Authority of the Council of *Laodicea*, Can. 59, 60. by which He saith the Reading the Apocrypha in the Church is forbidden, and the Canonical Books only are decreed to be read, of which there is there a Catalogue deliver'd. This He finds quoted by *Bishop Burnet* on the 6th Article. And it serves the *Bishop's* purpose admirably well; to shew what Books were then adjdg'd Canonical, even the same that we own now: but as to the purpose He brings it for, the Answer is, That the Council only forbade the Reading them as Canonical, or under the Name of Divine Scripture, which are decreed to be only those that follow: and this is confirm'd by another Passage in the 3d Council of *Carthage*, Can. 47. *Item placuit ut præter Scripturas Canonicas nihil in Ecclesia legatur*

legatur sub nomine Divinarum Scripturarum which Council of Carthage was confirm'd by the same General Council, that did confirm the other of *Laodicea*, viz. the Third of *Constantinople* in *Trullo*. Mr. Calamy seems to profess a great respect to that Council, now He thinks it to be for his turn. But if He should be prest with other things there express and enjoyn'd, we are apt to think it would have no great weight with Him. Our Church has spoken as plainly of the true Canon of Scripture as the Council of *Laodicea* could do, and as much disclaims the receiving any other Books as *Canonical*; but that the Ancient Churches read others as *Ecclesiastical*, is plain by the express Words of *St. Hierom* and *Ruffinus* before quoted.

We have only one thing more to do under this Head, viz. To answer the Argument which he brings against the lawfulness of reading these Books in the Church, which is taken from *Scandal*: That it may contribute to the misleading a great many weak and ignorant People, to phancy them with equal authority with the *Holy Scriptures*. There can be no manner of ground for any Understanding Person to be scandaliz'd, seeing such an express Declaration is made in the 6th Article: And as to the *Weak and Ignorant*, we

hope we have and shall have as great a care not to mislead them as He. Here therefore we note Two things,

1. That as things are now order'd, there is no likelihood, that any such danger should happen. There is no Man can prevent a possibility of Scandal in any of his Actions. If Mr. Calamy receives the Lord's Supper *kneeling*, it is possible some may think He worships the Bread: if *sitting*, it is possible some may judge that He denies the Deity of Christ: neither of these Suppositions are utterly unreasonable, for whole Churches have refus'd each of those Gestures, on the account of Scandal, by express Declarations. Yet because no such *misleading* is like to happen, Mr. Calamy allows the use of both, or either of them. And we verily believe, that by our Agreement to the lawfulness of using these Lessons, and by any use that ever we did or shall make of them, We never did, nor are likely to do, any mischief by *misleading* any one Person in this matter. Nor do we know of any one Person in all our days, that ever was *mislead* by any other Person's reading them, to *phancy them of equal Authority with the Holy Scriptures*. For as to the little *Hearsay* Story, that he tells us, of a Man in the late Storm, his mistake evidently came by his finding the *Apocrypha* bound

bound up with the common Bibles (which is a thing that we are never call'd to approve of) not from the Reading it in the Church, where probably He had never heard it read in his Life. Now to be afraid of a Scandal, not given but taken, and that barely possible to be taken, though never hapning so (that we know of) in fact, nor likely so to do, seems to us very unreasonable.

2. We consider further, that this *Misleading* may easily be prevented, so far as it concerns any Act of ours. For though Mr. Calamy in his *Passion* tells us, p. 249. That we *do this way tacitly approve of all the Apocryphal Lessons prescrib'd, as agreeable to the Word.* Our Denial is of as much authority, as his unprov'd Affirmation. They are read with this Limitation, *that no Doctrine is to be prov'd from them;* which supposeth that there may be some places or passages, not to be approv'd of. We own the Canonical Scriptures to be divinely inspir'd, and consequently infallibly true: so the many Chapters containing the Speeches of *Job's* Friends are true, as they lye in that Divine Book, viz. that they were so spoken by them. Yet we do not by reading them *approve* (no not *tacitly*) of all therein *as agreeable to the Word,* seeing the Lord has evidently *disprov'd* some things therein, and said, *That they had*

not spoken the thing that is right, Job 42. 8. We declare therefore to Him and to all the World, that we approve of the *Apocrypha* no further, than as it accords with the Canonical Scripture. And to prevent any danger, We do not only inform the People, and teach them so in the course of our Ministry; but when ever we are call'd to read any part of it, we may before or after particularly acquaint them, That it is no part of Scripture (any more than our Sermons, or other good Books are) and may warn them of any unwary passages that we find therein: And if the Minister (that He speaks of) who read the Book of Sports, did declare against the evil of any thing He found therein, and shew its contrariety to the Word: we are no judge of his Prudence, but we think He acted like an honest Man.

X. As to reading the old Translation of the *Of the old* Psalms: We cannot tell whether *Version of the* we fully reach'd his Meaning, as *Psalms.* He now explains it, and as it now appears bottom'd upon a great Mistake. He tells us, that He *do's not contend about our consenting to use that Version, p. 259.* but about *our agreeing to use it as exact, and in nothing contrary to the Word of God.* Nor do's He contend about the Doctrine or Truth of the Proposition in the old Version of *Psal. 105. 28.* that

that it may be true, *if meant of Moses and Aaron*; as is the new Translation, *if meant of the Egyptians*; and that it is doubtful which is most agreeable with the *Hebrew Text*. This He seems to allow. But supposing the old Psalter to be a part of the Book of Common prayer, He thinks we cannot say that it contains nothing contrary to the Word of God, seeing we do not know, but this Version of *Psal. 105. 28.* may be contrary to the Original Text. Saith He, *p. 260.* (speaking of the ejected Ministers) *they thought it was hard to say there was nothing in that Psalter, which was part of the Common-prayer Book contrary to the Word of God, when they could not tell, but there might.* The Version, He allows, may be us'd: and what is rendred or translated in *Psal. 105. 28.* may be right; but if it happen to be wrong translated (and the new Version right) then is it contrary to the *Hebrew Text*, which is the Word of God; and how then can we say that the *Common-prayer contains nothing contrary to the Word of God*? To this we say, We have already told Him, that by containing nothing contrary to the Word of God in the Subscription, we understand no Injunction or Prescription contrary to the Word, but that it may lawfully be us'd. This Sense He has never contested with us: and if it be true, then
though

though this *Psalter* were part of the *Common-prayer* and the Version of *Psal.* 105. 28. were doubtful whether contrary to the *Hebrew Text*, or no: Yet is not the *Prescription* to use this Version contrary to the *Word of God*. It being very lawful to use *Translations*, where some Passages were doubtful whether agreeable to the *Original*; or we must use none at all. But whatever be the meaning of the *Subscription*; *That the Common-prayer contains nothing contrary to the Word of God*; yet has it no relation to this matter at all. For whatever Order there may be in the *Common-prayer* to use that Version; yet the *Psalter* it self is no part of the *Common-prayer*, but a distinct Book bound up together with it; expressly distinguish'd from it in the Title of the Book: *The Book of Common-prayer, &c. together with the Psalter or Psalms of David*. And indeed it would be very improper to say, *The Psalter contains nothing contrary to the Word of God*; when it is all one Book of that *Word*, when it is it self the *Word* [of God], as much as any *Translations* can be, viz. so far as they agree with the *Original*. Time was, before the last Review of the *Liturgy*, there were divers faulty *Translations* of *Epistles* and *Gospels* (nor set apart by themselves as the Book of *Psalms* is, but) intermingled with the *Prayers*; yet the *Subscription* was

(in

of Ministerial Conformity. 235

(in that solemn manner in Dr. Burges's Paper) declar'd not to belong to them, in these words; *I understand that our Subscription to the Book of Common prayer, is to approve the Form of Common prayer contain'd in that Book, and consequently the Reading such Scriptures as are therein appointed to be read: and not to justify either the Printer's or Translator's error, which may be noted in any part of the Scriptures contain'd in the closure of that Book. For I see that Men are allow'd to read the same Scriptures after his Majesty's Translation.* This with the rest was affirm'd by the Archbishop to be the true Sense and Intention of the Church of England.

With this his main Objection (grounded on this Mistake) He insinuates another; *That if our new Translation be better, 'tis hard to be oblig'd to the constant use of that which is the worst,* p. 259. And here His Limitation to our Rule of Interpretation, touching the Sense of the Law-givers, especially with our Addition, *Where it is declar'd,* will help us to an Answer. The new Translation is best in it self, but the old Version was best for the singing, on saying it by the Points as they intended it in many places to be us'd. Nor do the Metrical Translations, nor any of them (from Sternhold and Hopkins to Brady and Tate) come so near to the Hebrew

brew Text as this, but admit of greater Additions and Alterations, &c. which yet He and we think lawful and expedient to be us'd. And how comes the Church to be censur'd for the use of the old Translation in Prose, when He and others continue to use the old Translation in Metre, or at least do not condemn it? And all Metrical Translations whatsoever are rather Paraphrases than Translations, and cannot be reasonably suppos'd to come so near to the Sense of the Holy Ghost, as our old Translation in Prose does, as defective and imperfect as it seems to be. And moreover, it being design'd by the Church in all places, where it is order'd to be said or sung, for the Exercise of the Churches Devotion, or as Hymns of Praise to God (agreeably to the practice of the Jewish, and the Antient Christian Church) it is not material to that end, that the Translation should be most exact or correct: but it is sufficient, that nothing be said or sung but what is true and agreeable to the Analogy of Faith. And thus we believe it is, with respect to this old Translation: By the use of which we do no more justify or approve the Errours or Mistakes of that Translation, than by the use of the new we do justify or approve the Mistakes of that; which we cannot reasonably suppose it can be
wholly

wholly without; it being done by Men that are fallible, as well as the other. And it is no part of the Honour due to these last Translators, no more than to the Martyr, by which the other was made, to think them infallible. We end this with Mr. Baxter's words, *Five Disput. Disp. 5. ch. 2. §. 12. When there are divers Translations of the Scripture in the same language ——— God has not told us which of all these we shall use, but given general Directions, according to which our own Reason or our Governours shall make choice.* And when our Governours allow several Translations to be read in Churches, One may be read for Instruction, and another for Singing and Devotion, as they are suited by the Metre, or Points to be said or sung.

XI. We pass on to the *Athanasian Creed*. Here Mr. Calamy gives us to understand, that though He esteems this Creed to be *Of the damnable* an Excellent Explication of the Do- *tory Sentences*ctrine of the Trinity, and hath ac- *in the Creed.*cordingly subscrib'd to it; yet it doth not follow that He must have subscrib'd to the Appendages, by which He means the *damnatory* Clauses in it, but doth downright declare, that He may *abhor those Clauses.* So that it seems Mr. Calamy begins his Creed at *And the Catholick Faith is this, &c.* and cuts off two Sentences in the middle, and excludes the
Close

Close or Conclusion. Now we for our parts had never heard or not remember'd, nor could suppose, that either He or any one else had subscrib'd the Creed with these Limitations. If we had, we had given another turn to our Answer, than we did. If Mr. Calamy can satisfy Himself with making his Subscription in this sense, well and good. To use his own words, *We are not willing to bear hard upon any Man*. Nor will we willingly insult over Him, or any one else. But we might expect from Him that He should deal with us with the same candour, which we think He hath often fail'd in; and we shall give Him our Reasons why we cannot admit of this sense of the Subscription, and why He should not allow Himself to put such an Interpretation upon it.

It is not deny'd, that He hath subscrib'd to the *Eighth Article*, in which it is said, *That the Creed* (in which these damnatory Sentences are) *is to be thoroughly receiv'd; for it may be prov'd by most certain warrant of Holy Scripture*. But only He saith, *Though the Article intimates that the Creed ought thoroughly to be receiv'd, yet it do's not necessarily follow that it takes in all the Appendages*. But if it do's not necessarily follow, yet if it probably follows, He should beware of abhorring these Sentences, and of writing against them:

them: but perhaps it may necessarily follow, that if the Creed be to be receiv'd *thorowly*, these must also be receiv'd. He adds the Latin word *omnino*, which in *Martinius's* Lexicon signifies *ex omni parte*; and must so be understood if English'd by *thorowly* (both of them being *originals*). Now is it not plain, that these Sentences are part of the *Credenda*, or part of this Form of words call'd *The Creed*, a Matter to be *believ'd*? And they are said to be ground'd on, or warranted by the Word of God, which is the Rule of Faith. Nay, not only are they one part, and put in one place, but in several; in the Beginning, Middle, and End thereof. How then it can be subscrib'd to be receiv'd *thorowly* and in every part, if these parts are not receiv'd, we cannot see. But he saith, That some have given this *Explication* before they subscrib'd. But to whom? Has it ever been publickly receiv'd? was there ever any authentick Declaration (as in *Dr. Burgess's* Case) that this was the true sense, and intention of the Church of England. According to his own good Direction, Let the sense of the Lawgivers be taken in. Have we not full Evidence, that the Lawgivers never intended to exclude these Sentences, as if they were not to be receiv'd, when they themselves have actually receiv'd them, and order'd them to

to be read several times in the Year in the Congregation? If they had not meant that these Sentences should be receiv'd, they would not themselves have receiv'd and own'd them: when the same Men receive the Creed into their Liturgy without omitting these Sentences, and declare it *ought* *thoroughly* to be receiv'd, how He can subscribe to their Declaration, that it *ought* so to be receiv'd, and yet not receive it as they do, we cannot imagine.

And if the sense that we have given of these *Damnatory Sentences* be good and genuine, why may He not yield to have subscrib'd them, without such Evasions? And if our Sense be not good and genuine, why in so large an Answer has He not endeavour'd to confute it? Do's He not believe, there are *damnable Heresies*, as well as *damnable Practices*, 2 Pet. 2. 1? Are not they *damnable Heresies* that are contrary to the *Foundation*? Are not the *Doctrines* of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation* of *Christ* the *Fundamental Doctrines* of the *Christian Faith*? Now it is with respect to these *damnable Heresies* that the *Anathema's* are pronounc'd. And are they any thing more than that of our Lord, That *He that believes not on the Son shall not see Life, but the wrath of God abides upon him*?

And

And here we might give Him some further account of the sense of our own Subscription. We said in our Defence, p. 80. That we are to distinguish the Doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son of God, from the Explications herein given thereof: and that it is only with respect to the Doctrines, that we are to apply the damnatory Sentences. This we think ought to be allow'd. For it is well known, that by the *Filioque* in the Procession of the Holy Ghost, in which the Greek Church differs from us; it is by no means intended that that Church should be anathematized by us, which some Great Men in our Church have vindicated from Heresy in that point. See Archb. Laud against Fisher; and the Bishop of Worcester's Vindication in his *Rational Account*. Besides there are some passages in the Explication, which all do agree, are not to be understood in the most proper and rigid sense; and therefore the Damnatory Clauses are not to be apply'd to them in that sense; As when it is said, That *As the Reasonable Soul and Flesh is one Man, so God and Man is one Christ*: None that we know of, do ever understand this, to be an exact account of this Mystery: The Union between the Reasonable Soul and Flesh in one Man being far different from the Hypostatical Union between the Divine and Humane Nature

Nature in one *Christ*. And when this is the universal sense of all in these matters, it ought in all reason to be allow'd, and taken as the sense of our Subscription.

Nor yet is it moreover to be imagin'd, that an unwilling failure in understanding of, or assent to every particular Explication of such great Mysteries, should be ever thought to be of that malignant damning nature; nor could be so intended to be declar'd. But we must suppose (as Dr. Hammond saith, in his *Treatise of Fundamentals*) That these Damnatory Clauses must be interpreted by their opposition to those Heresies that had invaded the Church, and were acts of Carnality in those that broach'd and maintain'd them against the Apostolick Doctrine, and contradictory to the Foundation; and were therefore to be anathematiz'd after this manner, and with detestation branded and banish'd out of the Church. Not that it was hereby desin'd to be a damnable Sin, to fail in the understanding or believing the full matter of all these Explications, before they were propounded; and when it might more reasonably be deem'd, not to be any fault of the Will, to which this were imputable.

And now, though we can joyn with Mr. Hoady in what He saith, That we cannot apprehend how the publick Service would suffer, were there no such Damnatory Sentence ever

read

read in it. Yet on the other side, it is certainly most reasonable to put the fairest Interpretation upon things that they are capable of, and in which there is the most general Agreement: and not by the hardest Interpretation that can be found, to strain and stretch difficulties to the darkeſt ſide.

XII. As to the laſt Head about Confirmation. He ſaith, *Mr. Ollyffe* *Of exclu-*
ſeems not to have taken the Diffi- *ding from the*
culty: which muſt needs be a ſlip *Sacrament*
of his Pen; for He owns after *them that are*
wards that we underſtood the Difficulty, and *not confirm'd.*
ſolv'd it. The Difficulty was, That *they*
could not conſent to exclude all, that had not E-
piſcopal Confirmation, from the Lord's Supper.
And it muſt be granted, that there was ſome
Difficulty in the Rubrick, as it lay in the old
Common-prayer Book, in theſe words, *And*
there ſhall none be admitted to the Holy Com-
munion, until ſuch time as He can ſay the Ca-
techiſm, and be confirm'd: Now the old Ob-
jection that ſeem'd plauſible in thoſe days,
is by Miſtake again taken up, when it is
wholly obviated by the wording of the Ru-
brick thus, *None ſhall be admitted to the Holy*
Communion till they be confirm'd, or be ready
and deſirous to be confirm'd; which Rubrick, as
amended, is of mighty uſe to us. For whereaſ
we are empower'd by a former Rubrick before

the *Communion*, to keep off all *Scandalous* Persons; so by this we are empower'd to keep off all the *Ignorant*, who are not *Ready* or prepar'd for Confirmation; so that we might be able to give it under our hands that they are so, as another Rubrick directs. And whereas we had said, that *it is enough, viz.* For admitting Persons to the Lord's Supper, *that qualifi'd Persons desire Confirmation in the substance of it.* He answers; *It must be own'd, that suits the way of Expression well enough, and that it answers the Rubrick.* And He seems pleas'd that He may make use of our Gloss to bring Him off as to his *Orders*: but there are more things to be considered as to that, than it concerns us here to enquire into. We are glad to see Him here in so good a Humour; and that we do so far agree, at least in this one Head.

The Substance of this Matter is indeed agreed on, which is the renewing of the Baptifimal Covenant, and the publick Profession and Owning thereof: That those who were Baptized in Infancy, being now come to years of Discretion, should themselves with their own Mouth and Consent, openly and before the Church ratify and confirm the same. This is the *Substance* and main Design of this Office. And this is no new impos'd Term of Communion, but what is

ne.

necessary or imply'd in all Accession to a complete Church membership, and Participation of all the Ordinances and Privileges belonging thereunto. The Ceremony also of *Imposition of Hands* by the Pastors of the Church, with their Benediction and Prayer for those that make the aforesaid Profession, is but little contested neither; being what has been practis'd all along in the Church from the Apostles Times. And if any one be ready for, and desirous to make the aforesaid Christian Profession, and to partake of this Benediction, He is ready for and desirous of Confirmation. And there is no reason, one would think, that any one should scruple this at the hands of the Bishop, as the Church's Pastor (whether Superior to, or Equal with the rest, doth not expressly come into consideration here: if He be a true Pastor, as He is allow'd to be by our moderate Dissenting Brethren, that is sufficient.) But if one should make a scruple hereof (which hardly can be suppos'd in any one that offers Himself to Communion in our Churches) this Scruple however doth only bear relation, either to the Officer administering, or to some Circumstances attending the Administration that are not essential to it; not to the Administration or Office it self; which one may be truly said to be desirous of, as well as ready for; though He

may have some Objections arising from any of the foregoing Scruples or Considerations, which are extraessential to the main Matter.

We come now to another main part of his Charge, as it lyes in Mr. Calamy's 10th Chapter of his *Abridgement*, about the *Oath of Canonical Obedience*. Here it may do well to state this matter a little, that we may understand the better what we are about. The Oath of Canonical Obedience runs thus: *I, A. B. swear that I will yield True and Canonical Obedience to the Bishop of N. and his Successors, in all lawful and honest things.* This Oath (He saith, in his 10th Chapter, as recapitulated here, p. 273.) *has reference to the stated Laws or Canons of the Church, and carries in it a plain Obligation, to comply with them, and submit to them, in their stated Practice, where they have not a Dispensation.* This now He will not have call'd a Swearing to the Canons, p. 284. For He is something aware of the Consequences of that, but He begs leave to keep to the Expression, which He had before us'd, and we have here set down. But we must not let Him go off thus. For if the Oath carries in it a plain Obligation to comply with the Canons, what is that but a swearing to them? How can we be oblig'd by an Oath to comply with them in our stated

Pra-

Practice, where we have not a Dispensation, if we do not therein swear to them? And this is that, which He tells us, gave the Offence; for they were not convinc'd but that many things by those Canons requir'd to have been the matter of their constant practice, would to them have been unlawful and dishonest; and therefore, He saith, they durst not come under such an ensnaring Obligation.

Now how doth He prove that the Obedience requir'd by this Oath is of such a nature? Why the great and only Argument He insists upon, *p. 274.* is taken from the *Notation* of the Word; which is ever look'd upon by all *Logicians* to be in it self a very weak sort of Argument, unless it be backt very well with others, that carry more force in them. *Canonical*, He saith, is according to the *Canons*: with Him, it is, and must be so, and cannot be otherwise; and therefore *Canonical Obedience* is Obedience according to the *Canons*. And He is past doubt that *Grammarians* and *Lexicographers* would verily describe it so. But He do's not produce any *Grammarians*, or *Lexicographer* of Note, or not of Note, that do's so describe it; which it is much, He did not do, if he could have found any such. It is well known that many words are of ambiguous Signification: However He will have it, that According to the *Canons*

must needs be the sense of the word *Canonical* in this Oath, without any ambiguity; and *must signify nothing*, if not taken in his sense, p. 275. Now if this be all his Argument, that this is, and must be, the sense of the word *Canonical*, and no other; then if we can shew Him another fair sense of the word different from His; then *His* is not necessary, and His Argument falls to the ground; and all this mighty stir about Obedience *to the Canons*, or *according to the Canons* (which is the same, as He explains it) comes to nothing. Now this we think is a fair sense of it: *Canonical* Obedience signifies that Obedience which the *Canons* or *Laws Ecclesiastical* require a Minister to promise or perform: And so it respects only those Rules or Laws that enjoyn this Obedience. As the *Canonical* Habit respects only that Canon, that prescribes that Habit; And *Canonical* Hours respect that Canon, that enjoyns them: so *Canonical* Obedience respects that Canon, *Canons*, or *Laws* which prescribe that Obedience: which we promise therefore with the Limitation, *In all things Lawful and Honest*. He hath nothing, not one jot or shew of an Argument farther to confirm his Sense or Notion (as was hinted before) in his 10th Chapter; Nor has He here, till He comes to his *History* of this Oath of *Canonical* Obedience,

dience, p. 299. which He thinks to make great Earnings of; but we believe will turn Him to worse than nothing. He produceth the Decrees and Orders of several Councils, to prove that the Canons *ought inviolably to be preserv'd* by those that were under their Jurisdiction; and who doubts, but when the Councils had made such and such Canons, they insisted upon it, and expected to have their Canons observ'd? But what is this to the *Oath* of those that were under their Jurisdiction to observe those Canons? Well, at length in the 11th Council of *Toledo*, A. 675. comes an Injunction, That *whosoever is admitted into Ecclesiastical Orders should bind himself by Writing (or Subscription) under his hand, in the sincerity of his heart, not to contradict the Canonical Rules; and in all things to give due Honour and Obedience to his Ecclesiastical Superiours*. Here are two Parts of this Subscription: *Not to contradict the Canonical Rules*, that is one thing. In those days the Subscribing to the Canons was so far injoyn'd as *not to contradict them*. And in all things besides (for so it must be understood) *to give due Honour and Obedience to the Ecclesiastical Superiours*. Here the *Honour and Obedience to the Ecclesiastical Superiours* is a distinct thing from their *not contradicting the Canons*: So that this do's not come home yet. With us there is the latter of these, *viz. Due Honour and Obe-*

Obedience to our Ecclesiastical Superiours; but our Constitution requires not our Subscription to the Canons.

He go's on, and tells us, after the Year 700, the Popes were for obliging the Bishops to take an *Oath of Fidelity* to them. And He saith the Form of this Oath is given by *Baronius*; but what the Form of it was, He do's not say; Whether it had any reference to the *Canons* or no. If it was like the former Subscription, it was quite another thing, for that was *Due Honour and Obedience in all things*, without Relation to the *Canons*.

He then go's on again, and tells us, That there was great care taken by the *Decrees of other Councils*, about the *Priest's Subjection and Management of Himself according to the Canons*. But here is nothing of an Oath or Subscription to observe them; so that this falls short of the former. But in the 13th Council of *Châlons*, A. 813. It was forbid, that any should swear to do nothing against the *Canons*; and to be obedient to the Bishop that ordains them, because they saw it dangerous. Here Swearing to do nothing against the *Canons*, is again distinguish'd from Swearing to be obedient to the Bishop; which sheweth that they were two things: And still this is different from Mr. *Calamy's* Sense of our *Canonical Oath* in his 10th Chapter. And even the Oath

in

in the Pontifical, as He he set it down, is First to be obedient to St. Peter the Apostle, and our Lord the Pope; and then to Observe the Rules, Orders, and Appointments of the Holy Fathers, as a distinct thing from the former; as also the Mandates Apostolical that should proceed from the Holy See. All this while the Subscribing or Swearing to the Canons, is one thing, and Swearing Obedience to the Bishops and Metropolitans, is another thing, and concerning a distinct matter. So that there is not one jot, even in all this to favour Mr. Calamy's Sense of our Oath of Canonical Obedience.

At length comes in the Reformation Here. Then He tells us, that Cranmer would not take the Oath, without a Protestation of his not being bound to it in any thing, that was contrary to his Duty to God, his King, and his Countrey: And afterwards Archb. Parker would not take it at all. But now the Bishops swear, He saith, That they will yield all due Reverence and Obedience to their Archbishops, their Metropolitane Church, and their Successors. But here is not one word or mention of the Canons in the Oath. The Inferiour (Clergy He go's on) swear to yield True and Canonical Obedience to their Bishop in all lawful and honest things. There's Canonical Obedience, or Obedience requir'd by the Canons,

nons, as the Custom had been, to the *Bishop*; but now *Limited* to prevent any danger or scruple; not according to the *Canons*, but in *all lawful and honest things*: which *Limitation* he owns to be brought in by the *Reformation*; and plainly seems to be added, only to take off the Obligation to that *Unlimited Obedience*, that was requir'd in the *Papacy*. And now let any one judge, Whether this *Oath* was founded upon the *Papacy*, when it overthrows it, by *Limiting* their *Unlimited Encroachments*.

At last He tells us, It was order'd in the Ecclesiastical Canons at *Aberdeen* in *Scotland*, That no Person should be receiv'd into *Holy Orders*, &c. unless he first subscribe to be obedient to the *Canons of the Church*. This is home to a *Subscription* to the *Canons* in that Church, in which it was requir'd; as we observ'd it had been in some other Churches in former Councils. But still this is nothing to the *Oath to the Bishop*, which was always a distinct thing from *Subscribing* or *Swearing* to the *Canons*: the *Oath* not having relation to the *Canons*, but to *all things* whatsoever, that are lawful and honest. And so the *Obedience* to the *Bishop* is upon no other account call'd *Canonical*, but only as requir'd by the *Laws* or *Rules Ecclesiastical* of this Church; that is, in short, It is call'd *Canonical*

nonical, in respect of the *Ground* of it, which are our *Canons* or *Laws Ecclesiastical*, requiring the taking of it; but not in respect of the *Measure* or *Rule*, by which it is to be order'd, as if that were the *Canons* (so call'd) it being requir'd *in all lawful and honest things* whatsoever. And now what is all Mr. Calamy's Discourse come to, when his own History militates against Himself, and his sense in this Matter?

But this is not all we have to say to Him. He hath now alter'd the state of the Question, and hath given quite another turn to things. That which He said at first (and which occasion'd our *Defence*) was, That *though the Obedience sworn, be limited to things lawful and honest, yet it is evidently suppos'd and taken for granted, That the Canons that are in force do require no other than such things— That the Limitation is to be extended only to future Commands, while an Obligation to comply with the things antecedently requir'd by the Canons as lawful and honest, was suppos'd: for the Church Representative could not be suppos'd to require things of any other Stamp or Character.* And this is equivalent to a *Swearing to the Canons* (as we said before) without leaving so much as a Supposition of any Limitation to things lawful and honest. By this He hop'd to represent us as *perjur'd* in times past, and

and hamper'd (as he calls it) for the time to come. This was the Sense we oppos'd. And as Mr. Hoadly had confirm'd what we said in the other General Head of *Assent and Consent*, so did He again in this, with great clearness of Argument.

But now the Tyde is turn'd. Mr. Calamy gives us a quite different Scheme. Now 'tis not Obediende to the Bishop absolutely that we are Sworn to, even according to the Canons; but with a great many Limitations which contain as much as we can desire. So that we can swear to the Canons, or to obey the Bishop according to the Canons (let Him word it which way He will) with the Limitations which He has given. But withal in this, we must mind Him that He contradicts Himself; and we shall find Him afterwards to contradict what He grants; so immethodical, and incoherent, and inconsistent is his Discourse in this matter. We are something unwilling to give it such hard words, but that it is the very truth of the Matter.

What He grants is contain'd in Three things, set down expressly, p. 337. and confirm'd by several passages in other places.

1. He allows, that we are not oblig'd to obey any particular Canons, that are not agreeable to us, till we are call'd upon by our Ordinary. He saith, p. 291. *A Clergy man is not bound to ob-*
serve

serve Canons, which He himself dislikes, if his Bishop do's not call upon Him. Nay, He brings down the Oath much lower than we do, That the Bishop can require nothing, but merely within the compass of the Canons. Some Church-men have been of his mind, and this is what they mean by Obedience according to the Canons. And we may hope to come into favour with Mr. Calamy, as much as the High and Stiff-men, that he thinks so Honest, and in the Right; for we grant a Higher Power to the Bishop, than even what this amounts to: and that we may be oblig'd to the Bishop, even without the compass of the Canons, so it be within the Limitation express'd in the Oath. We go on therefore with his Allowances.

2. He Allows that we are not at all oblig'd in the sight of God, to things which our Ordinary may esteem Lawful and Honest, if we have contrary Apprehensions of them, even though we may upon this account be represented, as contumacious. We could not speak more fully, nor more to the purpose we intended. The like is said, p. 293. but no words can be plainer. He adds indeed, That He can't see that the Constitution had made sufficient provision for our Judgment of Discretion, which is the thing they complain of; but we shall see that presently. We add his last Allowance.

3. He

3. He allows that if we are call'd upon to any thing that we are perswaded is unlawful and dishonest, we rather quit our Livings, than comply; we are not justly chargeable with violating our Oaths. And if we are not justly chargeable with violating our Oaths, if we chuse rather to suffer, than to do any thing that we are perswaded is unlawful and dishonest (as He here allows and affirms) then it is because we are not oblig'd by our Oaths to it. For if our Oaths do oblige us, then if we did not do accordingly, surely we should violate our Oaths. Now then, if we are not oblig'd by our Oaths in such a Case, when we are so perswaded, must there not be a *Judgment of Discretion* suppos'd, to guide our Perswasion? or upon what else is it, that our perswasion must be founded? And if the Church has provided this Limitation, on which this and his other Concessions are naturally grounded, then surely it has made ample *Provision for such a Judgment of Discretion*. But as to the wording this last Allowance, we suppose, He do's not think that the Penalty for the Breach of every Canon, is the *quitting our Livings*: the Penalty in that Notable Canon, He harps so much upon (for not burying a Corps offer'd to us) is but *Three Months Suspension*. We take it for granted, He means only, *If we suffer the*

Penalty.

Penalty, we are not chargeable, &c. And then we are agreed, He has spoken our very Hearts touching the meaning of this Oath. We will not deny him, what He would have, that in this Sense, *The Oath has a real Reference to the Canons of the Church*, So-be-it, that we be not oblig'd thereby to any particular Canon disagreeable to us, till call'd upon by the Bishop; and so-be-it, that we be not at all oblig'd to what He counts lawful and honest, if we have contrary Apprehensions, &c. How vastly is this Sense of the Oath now given by Mr. Calamy, different from what we had before? Yea, this Sense is much better and plainer, than that Sense of it, which is given by Mr. Shepherd, in his *Considerations on Mr. Bennet's Defence*, &c. which we are oblig'd to take off, because He saith, p. 98. that *He had just the same Notions*, (when He was oppos'd by his Bishop) *that we have*; we shall have occasion to mention that opposition afterwards: For the present we consider, Mr. Shepherd's sense of this Oath. He saith, p. 32. that he took the Oath as *obliging according to the general and allowed Practice of the Church*. This, the Bishop told him, *was nonsense*; and that not only in his Anger, but a second time, when he was sedate, as is set down, p. 39. Now although the Bishops superiority might allow him to

use a harder word, than it is fit for us to do towards that Brother ; yet we must needs say, it is not *our notion*, nor do we understand it. The *practice of a Church* may much explain the Rules of it, *lex currit cum praxi* ; but it is so *indeterminate* a thing, of so vagrant a Signification, as is by no means to be made the Condition or Limitation of an Oath. We therefore recommend to him Mr. Calamy's sense, in his three Concessions which we have set down, and to that we stand.

After these mutual Concessions, now on both sides, some considering persons might be apt to wonder, that Mr. Calamy should not have recall'd his 10th Chapter, as to this part of it ; and what further have we need to contend with him. But alas ! Notwithstanding all this, we meet with many passages in Mr. Calamy's discourse directly contradictory to all his three allowances ; and he pretends to answer all our Arguments (brought to prove the same things which he allows) as formally, as if he had granted nothing. And the Mystery of all this lies here ; He makes all the Concessions we could desire, when pinch'd with the Arguments ; yet seems to fight against every word, lest He should be thought to yield ; and intermingles the contrary Passages by the

the bye under other matter, that may as effectually prejudice others against our Ministry, as if the original Objection had been maintain'd. For instance,

1. Whereas He allow'd, that we are not bound to any particular Canons that are disagreeable to us, till call'd upon by the Bishop: Yet in other places, He represents us as binding our selves to *ensnaring Canons*; and particularly speaking of himself, He saith, p. 320. *I should be loth to bind my self by an Oath to the constant use of the Surplice*; He means by Canon 58. By which Form of Speech, He thinks, He do's not utter an untruth: He do's not indeed expressly assert, that we are bound by Oath to the constant use of it; but yet He dos it in effect, and as effectually; and would have all People think that if we have omitted the Surplice, we have broken an Oath. Such insinuations under equivocal Forms of Speech are the *Pestilente that flies in the Dark*. For our parts, we would not put our Bishop to the trouble of particularly commanding us to wear the Surplice, which we can and do use (while the Custom continues) as we do a Cushion on our Pulpits, or Cloth on our Communion-tables. But the Canon no more requires us to wear a *Surplice* than it do's a *Hood*, which we set not our Eyes on

once in a Year; nor is there one word of the *constant* use; when even in Colleges and Bishops Chappels it is frequently Omitted; almost constantly on Week days which yet are no more excepted in the Canon than the rest.

2. Whereas He declares that *we are not at all oblig'd in the sight of God to things which the Ordinary esteems Lawful and Honest, if we have contrary Apprehensions*: Yet he is still loth to part with his old Assaults. He insinuates, p. 328. that *we make such a promise, as if kept, would draw us into sin*; which is still to suppose (against plain words) that there is something besides what is Lawful and Honest, that we have promis'd to do: He seems willing that it should be thought that *the Canons are our in licitis & honestis*, and, p. 343. *in Ecclesiastical Courts all those pass for Godly Admonitions. that are agreeable to the Canon Law*. So, p. 350. for Ministers ~~to be bound by the decrees of others according to the Constitution, is as great an Obligation to act blindfold, as reasonable Creatures are capable of in any Case~~; though He acknowledges we are not at all obliged, unless we see the things to be Lawful.

3. Then as to his last allowance, that if *we are perswaded we are called upon to do any thing unlawful or dishonest, we (bear the penalty*

nalty, which He has carried up to) quit our Livings, rather than comply, we are not justly chargeable with violating our Oaths. In contradiction to this, speaking in his own name, as before, He saith, p. 324. *I should think it much better to disclaim the Canons, than to run the hazard of being charg'd with a breach of Oath for refusing to obey one.* We deny not but that these words are ambiguous, but 'tis easie to see what he would have the people understand by these Suggestions; and 'tis for their sakes that we shew how contrary these by-passages (that so frequently occur from place to place) are to his Concessions. He tells us, p. 348: *if there be any danger, it is hard for a wise Man to run into it: And I should think He would have the less comfort in that danger, when He remembers that He has brought it upon Himself by his own Promise and Engagement.* Though the Reader knows that our Promise and Engagement bound us to nothing but what there is no just danger in, viz. what is Lawful and Honest.

But neither here will He let us Rest, yea though He owns the same things that we had prov'd, yet do's He put us to dispute every inch of ground, before we take it. He pretends to answer all our Arguments brought to prove, what He himself do's ful-

ly allow: And we are bound to follow him.

The first thing which we advanc't against his sense of the Oath in his 10th Chapter (and consequently against the *unlawfulness* of taking it) was a Citation out of Mr. Baxter's *Christian Directory*; where that great Man had vindicated the Lawfulness of taking this Oath. He answers, p. 275. *I can only say if that excellent Person saw cause to change his mind, I know not why any should grudge him the Liberty.* And if He can say only this, He had as good have said nothing. For hereby he gives us up all the Advantage from our rational prejudice against his Assault, viz. that his charge was new, and that no such thing had for near 140 Years before been objected against Conformity; though there had been continual Occasion for it, had his sense of the Oath been true. Mr. Baxter tells us, that *Conformists and Nonconformists took the Oath*; none of them, nor the *Brownists* that oppos'd them, having this reasoning about it that He has now advanc't. And it is no small proof of the heedlessness (at least) of Mr. Calamy's way of writing; that the sense given by him of this Oath in his tenth Chapter is made one capital Reason or Cause of the *Nonconformity* of the ejected Ministers (on which near half his charge against

against us depends) and yet it doth not appear, that any one of the *ejected Ministers* had such a sense in their thoughts, till many years after they were turn'd out: The one and only Person, that He produceth as having published such a sense 27 years after his Ejection, being here own'd by Mr. Calamy to have been of another mind (even of our mind) in this matter till the year 1678 when the second Edition of his *Christian Directory* came out; though He would suppose that he chang'd his mind before the year 1689, when the Book he quotes was written. Hereby also he gives us up the Advantage from Mr. *Baxter's Arguments* for the Lawfulness of the Oath, and pretends not to give any answer thereunto. Only he tells us, that Mr. *Baxter* on second thoughts had chang'd his mind. Yet even this is not to be presently taken for granted: For if he had chang'd his mind, would he not have expressly retracted what he had wrote; and shew'd us how to answer those Reasons which satisfy'd him, when he wrote his *Directory*, and which he had deliver'd there? We must certainly distinguish between what he wrote in *Dialogue* (as is the Book quoted by Mr. Calamy, call'd *Nonconformity stated*) between L. and M. which admits of greater uncertainty as

to his own sense, and what he delivers doctrinally in answer to a Case of conscience: And between what is said in a *dispute*, where there might be Exasperations and Assertions for Argument sake, and what is delivered in a *sedate Determination*. Besides these and like differences between what is cited by us and what is cited by him, we have something further to offer in the Vindication of Mr. Baxter. For though he speaks more softly, he seems to own these things contrary or contradictory; and *can only say, He chang'd his mind*. We think we can say more. When sometimes he pleads for Episcopacy, and sometimes seems to speak against it; when sometimes he pleads for the Lawfulness of this Oath, and at other times to argue against it; it is with respect to different Persons. We shew'd in our *Defence*, p. 118. how sorry he was, that he was mistaken by Mr. Lobb, who (it seems) had quoted against *the Church of England*, what he only wrote against a party therein, which he calls the *Laudian Faction*. It is plain from what we said before about the *Savoy-conference*, that Mr. Baxter thought there were some, who had a part to act to exasperate the Nonconformists, by putting hard senses upon things which they, whose part it was to defend the Liturgy, allowed

not

not. These Mr. Baxter did earnestly encounter, supposing their number greater than we hope they are; though at the same time he own'd the Episcopacy which we own; and this Oath of Canonical Obedience as own'd by us and by the Church; though (as he suppos'd) not by that party in it. We desire for the Honour of *this excellent Person* to observe what he writes on purpose to free himself from the Charge of *contradiction*; which being understood will shew that he chang'd not his mind. It is in *Append. to his Life fol. p. 78*. He gives a true account of the Church of England, from their Articles, Apology, Homilies, Liturgy, Ordination, Canons; but saith, at last a new sort of Bishops rose up——these call'd themselves the Church of England, when there were but about 4 or 5 Bishops left alive, who, Dr. Hammond said, were of his mind. Some such domineered afterwards, but never prevailed neither to retract the Churches Books and Laws, nor to get the Major part of the Clergy to own them. Now all the vain question here is, which of these two parties shall be call'd the Church of England? Neither of them alone: They are two disagreeing parts of it. I argued against the last, professing not to do it against the first.

After

After Mr. Baxter's Authority and Reasoning we prest him with his own Obligation by the *Oath of Allegiance*, which He calls, a *pleasant turn*. And here we conceiv'd, that his awkward Exposition of the *Oath of Canonical Obedience*, would fall on his own Head, as to the *Canons* and *Statutes*, which are the *Queen's Laws*, to whom He is sworn.

We had shew'd him that the *Canons* are the *Queens Laws*, that as Mr. Baxter said, they are *materially Ecclesiastical*, but *formally Magistratical*. Now He is very peremptory as to these; He saith, *He is no more oblig'd to regard them, than if He liv'd in another Country*, p. 280. And his reason is, because *they are not confirm'd by Parliament*. We have no dispute with Him about our happy *English Constitution*, that *all our Laws must have the consent of our Representatives in Parliament*: But this we had affirm'd concerning these *Ecclesiastical Laws*, that they are confirm'd by *Parliament*, and so become part of the *Statute-law* of this Realm. This Statute is 25 *Hen. 8. c. 19*. He saith, p. 279. *He has perus'd it, and finds not that it Establisheth Canons, &c.* Now this is very strange; and his Reason is as strange; for, saith He, *that would make the Parliamentary consent (to ratifie such Canons) needless*; which is as much as to say, if they
are

are Established by Parliament, it would be needless that they should be Established by Parliament. But if He cannot reason better, yet let him read again once more ; In that *Act*, there is this proviso (which He saith, *He has perus'd*) provided that all *Canons, Constitutions, Ordinances, and Synodals provincial, not repugnant to the Kings Prerogative, nor to the Customs, Laws or Statutes of this Kingdom, shall be still used and executed notwithstanding this Act.* Do's not this Establish *Canons*, and numbers of them, more than He or we were acquainted with ? Then for the time to come it is enacted, that the *Convocation shall be assembled by the Kings writ, and shall not enact any Constitutions or Ordinances without the Kings Assent.* Do's not this Allow or confirm the *Constitutions or Ordinances*, that have the *Kings Assent* ? If He thinks, *No* ; He do's not only contradict Bp. *Stillingfleet* (than whom none possibly, who were not profess'd Lawyers, ever better understood the Laws) without naming any Lawyer or Book to confront Him ; but he contradicts the *Letters Patents* by which the *Canons of 1603* have the *Royal Assent*, in which the King saith, *The President and Bishops presented the same to us, most humbly desiring us to give our Royal Assent unto the said Canons, &c.*

accor-

according to the Form of a certain Statute or Act of Parliament made in that behalf in the 25 year of the Reign of K. Henry 8. —

We do by these presents give our Royal Assent according to the Form of the said Statute or Act of Parliament aforesaid. Had K. James I. no Lawyer to tell him, there was no such Act; or (when they had perused it) there was no such thing therein? Have all our Parliaments since never found out, that these Laws were not enacted? Especially when they are so deservedly jealous of the Freedom of Parliaments, or of any Incroachments upon them, so much as by a Circumstance; that when the *Canons* of 1640 were passed after the Parliament was up, and by Law the Convocation with it, they were quickly *disown'd*, and afterwards by 13 Ch. II. c. 12. *vacated*. Did they at the same time vacate the *Canons* of 1603 or the many confirm'd by 25 Hen. VIII? Yea, when Mr. Calamy saith, *They freed the Subjects* (i. e. declar'd them free) *from all the Canons not formally confirm'd, allow'd or enacted by Parliament*; Is it not plain from his own words, that those *Canons* from which they did not free these Subjects, are confirm'd, allow'd or enacted by Parliament? Yea, is there not a plain reference to the wording of 25 Hen. VIII. when this Law of 13 Ch. II. was enacted;

acted; some Canons were confirm'd, viz. by the *Proviso* mention'd before; others were allow'd, viz. when it is said that *none should be enacted without the Kings Assent*: So that really we do not find, that He has this way one jot *extricated himself*. He denies the Power of the Ordinary, but He has sworn Allegiance to the Queen, whose Laws these are. He saith, *we cannot plead the want of a Parliament Sanction*; nor can He.

Let us now come to what He says as to the *Statute-laws*, and whether He can *extricate himself* out of the Noose into which He sought to bring us, any otherwise than by *extricating* us also. And here we must desire the Reader to consider, wherein the force of our Argument lay, and then whether He has more *extricated himself* from the difficulty, than He has *us*.

Our Argument was not, that the Oath of *Allegiance* (now joyn'd with the *Abjuration*) is unlawful; or (which is the same) that it is an *Obligation to comply with all things antecedently cammanded by the Laws* (Ecclesiastical and Civil) as *suppos'd and taken for granted to be Lawful and Honest*. But we argu'd against *this* sense *ad Hominem*, by shewing the parallel between the two Oaths; that as the one could be not so understood, so neither could the other: That

as He would not own, that the Oath of *Allegiance* was to be understood in such a Sense, so neither could He rationally assert the *other* to be so. To imagine therefore that we had a design to discourage Her Majesty's Subjects from taking the Oath, as He would insinuate, p. 277. and to go formally to prove, *that the Oath of Allegiance is not to bind all that take it to obey every Law of the Land*, as He do's, p. 278. looks, as if He did not, or would not understand what we are upon, or what He himself is doing. If He thinks He did understand what we drove at, we will consider his answer, and whether it will not suit us against his Cavil. Speaking of Himself, He saith, p. 278. *I take the Oath of Allegiance to be an hearty contributing in my Sphere to the Defence and Support of the Queen's Person, Crown, and Dignity, under the Direction of the Laws of the Land.* in like manner we say, *we take the Oath of Canonical Obedience to be an hearty owning of the Authority and Jurisdiction of the Bishop of the Diocese, under the Direction of the Canons of the Church.* We can speak the last words freely now, because (for his own sake) He'll free us from the Ambiguity of the words immediately. For He go's on, *I am far from looking upon my Allegiance sworn to refer to all the Laws of* the

the Land—— were it the Intention of an Oath of Allegiance to bind all that take it to obey every Law of the Land, then must every Person that is under such an Oath, be oblig'd to be acquainted with all our Laws, nay, further who ever breaks any Law (though in the most trifling matter) must be chargeable with violating his Allegiance: But who ever asserted either of these? So far is this from being true, that we have many Laws, that we are not concern'd so much as to read; and others, the breach of which we are not concern'd in conscience, so much as to detect. Now is there a word of all this, that we cannot as fully say, as to the Oath of Canonical Obedience? We are far from looking upon our obedience sworn to refer to all the Canons of the Church —— were it the Intention of an Oath of Canonical Obedience to bind all that take it, to obey every Canon of the Church, then must every Person that is under such an Oath, be oblig'd to be acquainted with all our Canons; nay, further, who ever breaks any Canon (though in the most trifling matter) would be chargeable with violating this obedience: But who ever asserted either of these? (except Mr. Calamy) so far is this from being true, that we have many Canons that we are not concern'd so much as to read; and others, the breach of which, we are not oblig'd

oblig'd in conscience so much as to detect. If this way of arguing extricates Him, it extricates us. Allegiance is the legal Obedience that every Subject bears to his Prince. And Mr. Calamy saith, p. 280. if the legislative Power be warrantably exerted, I look upon my self bound to obedience by virtue of the Consent of our Representatives in Parliament. The same say we in the Case before us. Yet He asks a plain Question, Do's Mr. Ollyffe think that I am as much bound to keep Lent, as He is to excommunicate one of his Parishioners, for want of paying his Fees in the Ecclesiastical Court, when He is requir'd by his Ordinary? And we answer Him as plainly; yes verily, we think He is, to all intents and purposes; i. e. to take up his own words about our case, p. 337. We can allow that he is not oblig'd to keep Lent, if it be not agreeable to him, till He is call'd upon by the Queen. We can allow, He is not at all oblig'd in the sight of God to keep Lent or to do any other things, which the Queen may think Lawful and Honest, if He have contrary Apprehension of that or them, though He may upon this Account be represented as contumacious or Seditious. We can further allow, that if when He is call'd upon to keep Lent and judgeth it unlawful or dishonest, He rather quit his livelihood (and bear the penalty)

nalty) than comply; He is not justly chargeable with violating his Oath of Allegiance. He is rather to be pity'd than upbraided. Thus have we made him the same Allowance that He has made us, and He, and all Christian Subjects, need them as much as we: And we are not one jot more beholding to Him for the Allowances, than He is to Us.

It may be further observ'd, that He did not first teach us to get out of this Snare, by shewing the Absurdity of this Doctrine, that the Oath of Obedience to a Governor binds him that takes it to all the Laws that He governs by, or that they must all be taken for granted to be Lawful and Honest: For we also had mention'd this Absurdity in our Defence, p. 92. that this were to oblige us to Multitudes of Canons unknown of provincial, national, yea general Councils, &c. But to see what divers Weights He useth; this which was a good Argument *ab absurdo*, p. 278. when it serv'd his purpose, is worth nothing, p. 285. where He saith, *it is hard; but the hardship ariseth from the Nature of the Constitution, and not from the Explanation.* It was good evidence before, that the Oath of Allegiance could not be explain'd so, as to bind us to all the Laws; but now 'tis good evidence that it must be the right Explanation of the Oath of Canonical Obedience

dience, to bind us to all the Canons. The Explanation now is right and the Constitution wrong, though before in just the same case, the Constitution was right, and the Explanation wrong and absurd.

It is tedious to say the same things over again. The same answer that He makes, as to the Citizen's Oath to the Mayor, holds exactly as to us. And though, p. 283. He pretends to shew some differences, there are none. He saith, many of the By-laws of the City they have no opportunity of knowing, till a particular occasion draws out orders concerning them. The same we have already said, as to the Canons and Rules of the Ecclesiastical Courts. He saith further of the Citizens, their by-laws are changeable. The same say we of the Canons. He adds, it do's to all intents and purposes answer their Oath, if Freemen are ready to comply upon notice from their Governours that Obedience is expected from them. And how can He now set down this as a difference, when He hath expressly own'd the same thing touching the Oath of Canonical Obedience, p. 337.

We will here a little further consider how He endeavours to get off from the Absurdities that we press him with.

The

The first Absurdity, that we charg'd him with, was this: That if this were the meaning of the Oath, which He gave, it would be an equal binding Him, that takes the Oath, to all the Bishops; whereas it only respects the Bishop of the Diocese in which the Minister lives. And here He saith, He is to seek for the Consequence; For why is He that swears He'll obey the Bishop of Lincoln according to the Canons, oblig'd by that Oath to obey the Bishop of London? Why, because, Sir, as you before had stated the matter, He is bound by this Oath to all the Canons, which He is thereby to make the Rule of his stated and constant Practice, where He has not a Dispensation; And so 'tis indifferent who commands them, whether the Bishop of Lincoln or the Bishop of London or neither of them. For by this Doctrine, He is bound by his Oath to obey the Canons, whether one or other commands Him, or neither. The Canonical Obedience, being according to the Canons, as it was then explain'd, was sworn to all the Canons indifferently, to make them the Rule of the Ministers Stated and constant Practice, unless He be otherwise dispens'd with, without any necessity of any further command. This was the matter as you first stated it, p. 273. and as still now and then you would have your Reader un-

derstand it. Indeed by your Concessions before mentioned you have now made a different State of the Case; though thereby you contradict, what you had before laid down, which we reply'd to in our Defence. Now indeed you say, *we are not oblig'd to obey any particular Canons, till we are called upon by our Ordinary, &c.* this makes an Alteration indeed; we may not be called upon alike by all the Bishops; nor are we bound by all, but only to *that*, to which we are called upon by our own Bishop: And the Bishop of *Lincoln* may insist upon one thing, and the Bishop of *London* upon another. But, Sir, we will excuse you from delivering us from our Fears in this matter; for we do not like your Way for it, unless we take in your two next Concessions; and then it do's not a great deal differ from our own Sense, which secures us very well, according to the Words of the Oath, that we are to obey only in things Lawful and Honest. But in the former way the Absurdity remains, which you were bound to have got off from, in consistency with your former sense of the Oath in your 10th Ch. unless you had acknowledged your Mistake therein.

Another Absurdity we urged was, that in Mr. Calamy's Sense, the Oath must bind us,
not

of Ministerial Conformity. 277

not only to the Canons of 1603, but to Multitudes of others, which are still by the Act declared in force, so far forth as they are not contrary to the Laws of the Realm. Now this He stands to; if it be an Absurdity, the Constitution is to blame for it, and we must bear it as well as we can. But in this He is now a little merciful to us; and saith only, *There must be an Obligation upon the Clergy to comply with them, when they are call'd upon.* Now this is pretty well, taking in the Limitation, so be it, it be in things lawful and honest. But Sir, this was not the Absurdity as we propounded it; for according to your former State of the Matter, we were to make these also the *Rule of our stated and constant Practice*, and there being such a multitude of them, we should never be able to know them all, in order to our *stated and constant Practice* of them, which you would then have had us sworn to.

But Here Mr. Calamy finds or makes a greater Absurdity than this. *I can hardly tell*, saith He, *how to suppose any thing more absurd than to hear Protestants applaud and extol a Constitution that is founded upon a bottom wholly Popish.* Now what does He mean by the *Constitution*? If He means our Church-government, not only is what he saith very unjust, but it is brought in by Head and Shoulders,

ders, for we were not talking one Word about it. If He means it, with Respect to the *old Canons* made in Popish times, that we are bound to observe *them, if call'd upon*: He must take the Supposition before laid down; that they are only such that are in force, as are not *contrary to the Laws and Statutes of this Realm*, which do establish the Reformation. When our Doctrine and Worship are *establish'd by Law*, viz. the Statutes confirming the Articles and Liturgy; then by 25 Hen. 8, all Canons contrary thereunto are entirely vacated. How then are they founded on a *Popish bottom*, when Popery is so directly excluded? Does He think it an Absurdity for Protestants to *applaud and extol* the Reformation? But here is Mr. Calamy's Mistake, by which He comes to run Himself into a greater Absurdity still, whilst He imputes that to us, which is none. Popery consisted in requiring a Subscription to an Absolute and unlimited Obedience to all the Canons of the Church; and an Oath of unlimited Obedience to the Pope, Metropolitans and Bishops. Whereas our *Constitution* requires no Subscription or Oath to the Canons at all; nor yet any Oath to our Bishops, but only *in lawful and honest Things*. And How is it then built upon a Popish Foundation? This is a Foundation only of Mr.

Calamy's

Calamy's Fiction. The Popish Foundation was evidently raised and destroy'd by our Constitution; and not our Constitution built upon it.

The next Absurdity that we urg'd was that Mr. *Calamy's* Sense as laid down in his 10th Chap. *Would make the Limitation in the Oath useless and ridiculous. But where the Consequence lies, He saith, He cannot discern.* We cannot help that, but yet we believe, we can make it very clear. If the Oath requires Obedience to all the Canons (suppose only, if we are called upon) and all the Canons must be supposed and taken for granted, to contain nothing but what is lawful and honest (as He saith expressly) then to what end in the World is the Limitation of Obedience in Things lawful and honest, when there is nothing supposed that can be otherwise? But Mr. *Calamy* endeavours to come off from this Absurdity two Ways, which are contradictory the one to the other, according to his usual Custom in this matter. One is in his first State of this Business in his 10th Chapter, that this Limitation to Things lawful and honest was only to be extended to future Commands, while an Obligation to comply with the Things antecedently required by the Canons was supposed and taken for granted in the Oath. So that according to this Interpretation the Oath is

made to consist of two Parts, to obey the Canons *already made* without any Limitation; and to obey *future Commands* with the Limitation of *lawful und honest*, whereas the Oath runs plainly in one Tenour, without any distinction of Members, with a Limitation in the last Words of it, to *all lawful and honest Things*. So that it is plain, that the *Limitation* does belong to all the Obedience that is sworn by the Oath; and one would think it were not possible to torture it to any other Sense.

This Mr. Calamy now seems to be aware of, and therefore He hath another Shift, that is quite contrary, for it, p. 287. that this Limitation doth indeed also look back to things *antedecently required*; because that there was some Antient Canons *still in force and not repugnant to the Laws of this Realm*, which yet *are neither lawful nor honest*; and 'tis not ridiculous (he saith) to understand it of them, though it be useless of the Canons made since the Reformation: But He forgets, that the Supposition mention'd in the Act, of *not being contrary to the Laws and Statutes of this Realm*, does bring down these antient Canons to the Standard of the Reformation, and so preclude those that in their own Nature are unlawful and dishonest: Those *Statute-laws* having now settled the Reformation; and all Canons

contrary thereunto are by the *Act* made void; and such only remain in force as are agreeable to the *Articles* and *Liturgy* established by Law, that is, to the Law of the Land and the Reformation: Although they, and the Canons made since, and all other Laws are capable of a wrong Application, in the Administration of the Government, and therefore stand in need of this *Limitation* of our Obedience to *Things lawful and honest*; and therefore the *Limitation* has been as constantly us'd since the Canons of 1603, as before; and has no more Respect to the Antient Canons than to them, but to all of them and to all other Commands alike. And by Mr. Calamy's Concessions, We are not by the Oath oblig'd to any particular Canons (antient and modern) till called upon by our Ordinary; and if He thinks them lawful and honest, and we have contrary Apprehensions of them, We are not oblig'd to them at all, &c.

There only remains one thing more. After He has pretended to answer Mr. Hoadly (and consequently his own Concessions) He will give us the Judgment of two Bishops, viz. of the Bishop of Lincoln to Us, and of the Bishop of London to Him, p. 306. As for Mr. Ollyffe, He saith, I am misinform'd, if He was not under an Oath of Canonical Obedience to Bishop Barlow. I wish He did not lie under greater
Mi-

stakes than this; but Bishop *Barlow* was dead before I came into the Diocese. However we will take our Part. It is a Story, which Mr. *Shepherd* sets down, *Considerations on Mr. Bennet's Defence*. p. 32. where it is said, that the Bishop ask'd Him, *Have you in all things conform'd according to the Canons of the Church?* He answer'd, *No, my Lord*; and then gave his Exposition of the Oath, that we considered before. The Bishop reply'd, *That's Nonsense; then you are perjur'd*. Now we must needs say, that all must allow Grains to a Man (though never so good) in repeating the Words of another ten or twelve Years after they were spoken, and which He heard in much Trouble and Perturbation of Spirit. It seems probable to us, that whereas Mr. *Shepherd* had been Suspended half a Year before for forty Days, that upon his Restoration He had been admonish't about some particular *Canons*, which the Bishop now refer'd to in his Question. And upon his Answer *No*. (whether by mistaking the Bishop's Question, or otherwise) The Bishop pass'd that Censure, which Mr. *Calamy* thinks so much for his Purpose. But that it will not serve his design (unless his design was to reflect on Bishop *Barlow*, whom Mr. *Shepherd* believes p. 65. to have been God's Friend, though his Enemy, and expects ere long to meet in Heaven)

will plainly appear, from the manner that His Author represents this matter in. Mr. Shepherd saith, p. 31. *that the Bishop fell into an extream Passion, and immediately takes another Way to vent his Spleen; which was by the Words we just now recited, and which are Mr. Calamy's Proof against us. The same, Mr. Shepherd repeats after the Words touching the Bishops being, in such a Passion, and venting it in such an unbecoming and extravagant manner.* And He further tells us; that when the Bishops Passion was over, or as He expresseth it, *was as sweet now as he was soure before, p. 38.* He offerd to take off his Suspension, &c. And, saith Mr. Shepherd, *Surely my Lord did not believe Himself when He told me, every one was Perjur'd, that did not conform up to the Canons (which by the way were far from being the Bishops Words) For if so, it was very ill done of his Lordship to restore me to my Station in the Church without signs of Repentance, and I gave none.* Then speaking of the Bishop's further Kindness to Him, He adds, p. 41. *This shews that the Bishop's impective did flow from his Passion, not his Judgment, when He told me, I was Perjur'd.* The Reader must take notice that this Mr. Shepherd is now a Nonconformist Minister, and wrote the Book cited, in Defence of his Nonconformity. And what then Has Mr. Calamy

Calamy got by this Story, but a proof (according to his Author's own Representation of the matter) that a good Man once *spake* hastily and *unadvisedly with his Lips*.

We proceed now to his Discourse of the the Canons of 1603. Concerning which indeed He does use us in a way so reflecting, that we are perswaded all Indifferent Judges cannot but take notice of it. He represents us (by returning Mr. Hoadly's Words upon us, p. 353) *as acting as we think fit without regard to the Canons; as making a Shew of Obedience, and acting clandestinely, till we are found out and censur'd.* So in his own Words, p. 337. *as intending to neglect sundry Canons, which we know our Diocesans intend to oblige us strictly to observe; as reflecting Discredit upon the Church* p. 288, *by pleading Conformity to it, and taking it for granted that sundry of the Canons that have passed in the several Convocations since the Reformation, and that belong to the Standard of the Ecclesiastical Government to be excluded by the Limitation, viz. from being lawful and honest.* By these and many such Reflections interspers'd every where, and making up the strength of his Answer to us; He hopes to gain a double Point: To expose us to the Dissenters for being of a Church, whose Canons (in our own Opinion) are so

very

very bad; and striking them with a kind of
Horror at the *Canons*, when even the Cler-
gy themselves think them unlawful and dis-
honest. On the other side, He would ex-
pose us to our *Governours*, as dissemblers with
them, or worse. To vindicate our selves
from these Reflections, we shall repeat the
distinction, which we made in our *Defence*;
touching *Canons* that command nothing to
us; and *Canons* that require something of
us.

I. As to the first sort, we declar'd, that
the excommunicating Canons do not concern us;
no, not any way; not for the reason that
He would assign for us, because they are
vacated by the Act of Toleration, for that do's
not concern us. We did indeed, *p. 94.* hint
such a thing in reference to the Dissenters
qualify'd according to that Act. But we
did not answer his Objection that He made
to us from these *Canons* by that (as He
would represent us to do, *p. 312. 318.*)
But our answer was, that *these Canons require*
nothing of us: And that we are not oblig'd
to consent to all the Rules made for the pro-
ceedings of the Courts, as He would sup-
pose by his Exposition of these *Canons* in
his 10th Chap. It is true, He saith now, that
though they contain no Order or Command, yet
they lay the Foundation of a command to pub-
lish

lish an Excommunication, &c. and that this He had said before. Indeed He did mention it under some of the Canons, though under others (as we told him) viz. 8th 9th, 10th, 11th, and 38th. *He did not so much as mention it; but argues against consenting to them, Submitting, and swearing Subjection to them.* So that we had reason to refer the matter of publishing Excommunications to its proper place in our Defence, and to argue against a Cavil from these Canons, that He had no ground for. We are not call'd to consent to them, nor submit to them, nor swear Subjection to them, nor to enter into Combinations, &c. as He speaks. But if it be said, we are concern'd in these Canons, if there come an order to publish an Excommunication upon them; we might answer, that these Canons have been form'd above an hundred Years, and we never heard of any order sent out to any Minister to publish an Excommunication upon any of them; and we are apt to think there never was any. So that the Objection is grounded upon a meer imaginary fear, a bare possibility of what is never likely to come to pass. But our further answer is, if any such order can be sent out, it must have its Foundation on some other Laws or Canons, not here mention'd: Nothing being more plain, than that in these

Canons,

Canons, there is not one word of sending out such orders or commands to us, or of our Submitting thereunto; and therefore we say still, these Canons do not concern our practice: And if there be any other Laws or Canons requiring us to publish Excommunication, we shall speak of them under the next Head, which do's concern

2. Such Canons as do command or enjoyn us something in our Ministry. And why we should be represented, as having no regard to the Canons, of making light of them, &c. and Mr. Hoadly's words about this matter apply'd to us (which we dare say, He never thought of doing) seems very odd: Because in this we did more than Mr. Hoadly, for we vindicated the Canons that concern'd us (even the worst that He could pick out) against his misrepresentations of them. And though we prov'd (as did also Mr. Hoadly) that we were not sworn to them; yet did we not reflect any discredit upon them, much less on the Church because of them.

To speak now more clearly (and to make Him understand us, if He will) concerning these Canons of 1603, that respect our Behaviour and require something of us; we distinguish between them as in themselves, as they are generally set down in the Book, and as they may be apply'd to this or that particular

particular case in the Administration of the Government.

When we consider these Canons (enjoying as aforesaid) *in themselves*, we complain of none of them as evil or sinful, or (as He reflects, p. 283.) *that conscience will not allow us to obey*, supposing them to be *rightly apply'd* in the particular Cases by the Governour. But when we come to the *Application* of them to this or that particular case by our Governour, then as Mr. Hoadly expresseth it well, p. 146. *the Oath supposeth that all his commands may be unlawful, and leaves us to judge of all as well as some.* For instance, supposing there be a Canon obliging us to denounce-excommunicate, Persons so decreed to be in the Courts (there is no such in this body of Canons, but supposing there be such a Law) We do not oppose it in the general, or censure it as unlawful or dishonest: It may be very well, when manag'd aright; as we shew'd at large in our *Defence*, p. 114, &c. But when this comes to be *applyed* to a particular case by our Governour, it may be utterly unlawful; and we are no more oblig'd to it in that case, than if no such Law had been. Nay, even as to the excommunicating Canons (though it be more than needs to mention them) we do not think it unlawful in the general to
excom-

excommunicate the Depravers of the Liturgy, Articles, &c. Supposing therefore that we should be the first for these hundred years that should have an Excommunication sent down to be denounc'd on these Canons: We then consider, if it be a Man that designedly *charges the Common-prayer as repugnant to the Scriptures* for worshipping God through Jesus Christ; and shall openly Blaspheme the Redeemer, and the coming to God in his name; we should forthwith denounce him excommunicate; for it is *Lawful and Honest* so to do. But if it be a Man, that has rashly charg'd the *Common-prayer as repugnant to Scripture*, in requiring Godfathers, &c. and is maliciously prosecuted by some promoter; and cannot be convinc'd of his Errour though He humbly desire information; for our parts we should then demur about it. This will be more plain in any Canon, where any thing is enjoyn'd us, relating to our Function. Some Canons, no question, are better than others: And (blessed be God) our Law has secur'd us against Canons evil in themselves, contrary to sound Doctrine, Gospel-worship or good manners, by establishing the Liturgy, Articles, Homilies, &c. and vacating (by an express Statute) all Canons contrary thereunto. But there is not the best Law that can be made by

Man, but may be *apply'd* unlawfully, in a particular instance. We can submit to these Canons (when call'd on) and as many more with this *Limitation*, so far forth, as in that case, we are called to apply them to, our Submission be *Lawful and Honest*: And without that *Limitation* we cannot submit to any one of them, nor to any other Laws made by Man. This must be always understood, both by Commanders and Submitters. Mr. Calamy saith right, we have never seen the Bishop of *London's Episcopalia*. But no doubt when He presseth those particular Canons upon the Account of their Oath to Him; He means it in such particular Cases and Instances as they judge it Lawful to observe them; for no otherwise is their Oath concern'd. It were easie to go over the Canons again that He has pick't out to quarrel with.

We do not oppose the *Rejecting them that refuse to kneel* at the Lord's Supper, in the general; and when it comes particularly to be apply'd to those that refuse it by reason of irreverent prophaneness, or because they will not own the Deity of Christ, &c. though to refuse a poor scrupulous Person, that only fears sin in that gesture, and cannot have the ordinance elsewhere, may not perhaps seem Lawful and Honest.

For

For Ministers to exhibit the names of Non-communicants to the Bishop, is in the general lawful and good: And it is only with respect to some few particular Persons and Cases in which it may prove otherwise; in which cases we are under no Obligation to do it.

And this is yet more plain, when those Applications of the Canons to what is Lawful and Honest, appear to be the main design of the Compilers and are most frequently insisted on by the Governours; and the Application to what is unlawful (which the best Law of Man is Subject to) appears to be strain'd on purpose to expose it, contrary to the ends of the Compilers and Practice of the Governours. So the keeping off of Strangers from being Communicants (when the Church-wardens inform us thereof) is lawful, when they come from their own Parishes in opposition to their Ministers, and do create disorder thereby: But do's not relate to those who either have no Ministers or Communications in their own Parishes; or are constant communicants in them, when there is a Communion there; who we shew'd Him are rather encourag'd at other times, to come to other Parishes for more frequent Communions.

So the Requiring Ministers to baptize all the Children born of Christian Parents in their parishes

parishes (care being taken according to Can. 29. for their Education) is lawful and good, and Mr. Calamy seems to be of the same mind. In the 1st Synod of Vitri, Ch. 2. part 8. We have this determination. *It being demanded, whether the usual form of prayer should be recited of Infants born out of Matrimony and in Adultery or Incest, because there are in it these words Begotten of Father and Mother whom thou hast called into thy Church. This Synod judgeth that there should no difficulty nor dispute be had about it; because that under the name of Father and Mother are not only comprized the more immediate and next Parents that begat them, but also their Ancestors to a thousand generations. And this also should be consider'd, that though the parents be faulty, they are not thereby totally excluded God's Covenant. But the extending this Canon to the Children of Jews and Infidels is a strain upon it: And the cases wherein we cannot comply with it are few, and never like to happen: though if they do, we are under no Obligation to comply with it then: yet we shew great respect to this and other Canons, when rightly apply'd. We do not reject the Canons nor make light of them; nor did we ever put our Governours to the trouble of a particular Admonition to us for the neglect of any of them. But as we say and prove that*

we

we were never sworn to them (which yet He always supposeth; and go's upon that in his reflections) so in some cases to which they may be apply'd, we may not be able to submit to them (which cases may be put to the test of Humane Laws) yet do we carefully avoid Scandal by wilful neglects of such Canons, as we judge our Diocesans have oblig'd us strictly to observe; still remembring in all our obedience to do nothing but what is Lawful and Honest.

As to the 58th Canon; Mr. Calamy do's not dispute against the Lawfulness of wearing a Surplice in it self, but do's plainly enough allow the lawfulness thereof. But He thinks, such Garments should *not be impos'd by Ecclesiastical Canons, nor pleaded for, as impos'd.* We are not upon that now; we have considered that matter in reply to his Introduction. *And He should be loath (he saith) to bind himself by Oath to the Constant use of it, if He could digest all the other parts of Conformity;* and reckons that any may refuse to bind themselves by Oath to Obedience to such a Canon with a due regard to Peace and Order. By all this it appears still, that He accounts the Oath of Canonical Obedience to be a *swearing to the Canons,* and to a *constant use* of what is prescrib'd by them, whether one is called upon by his Ordinary,

nary, or no. This He go's upon, according to his first State of this matter, though afterwards He contradicts it, as we have shew'd. This He continually harps upon, and we upon Reasons that still stand firm, have deny'd. But He is very modest here in saying, one may *refuse to bind Himself by Oath* to such obedience. We know his mind very well by his *Introduction*, that if it be requir'd (though without an Oath) it is below his Free and generous Spirit to submit to it, for that very reason because *it is requir'd*, though it be in it self a Lawful and an indifferent Thing; He will leave that low Spirit of Subjection and Obedience, to the commands of our Governours in lawful things, to the poor-spirited Conformists; but He cannot bring himself to such mean Submissions, though it be never so much for *peace and order sake*.

In what He saith further of these *Canons*, there are only some few personal Reflections, not worth any more notice. We have shewn Him how the *Oath* refers to them and how not: How He has expressly own'd what we desire, though He disputes against his own Concessions, for Reasons best known to Himself. There is only one passage we must mention for our vindication (because it discovers a little too much gall.) He had objected

that

that Ministers are debarr'd *private Fasts* by *Can. 72*. We told Him, it did not forbid fasting in their Families, for that is not *Solemn*: nor did it forbid more solemn Fasts, for Devotion in our Parishes; for there are above an hundred days in the year allow'd by *Authority* for that end: But that it forbade *fasting for seditious ends, and particularly for exorcising possessed Persons*. Upon this He saith, *p. 325. aye, aye such seditious Meetings, as Grindal's prophecyings were, &c.* and represents us as counting all *Sermons and Week-day Lectures to be Seditious and tending to Schism*. And to make his Reflection more keen, He expresseth great Surprise, that *such things should come from such a Man as Mr. Ollyffe, &c.* We know not what He will accuse us of next. He had made his Objection only about keeping *Fasts*; and never mention'd *Grindal's Prophecyings* in his charge. Nor therefore did we mention them, nor think of them, much less did we speak *against Sermons and Week-day Lectures*; which we question not but the Lord has greatly own'd; and we do highly approve, and desire the success of them. But we said, it forbade Fasts for Seditious ends, or such as *were not appointed by Law or Authority*; as we shew'd him, Fasts for the exercise of Piety and Devotion are; one of them every week: And

one would think that this Gentleman should be so much for order in an establisht Government, as to think that those times and methods for Fasts, &c. should be rather chosen, which the Governours licence and think expedient. And they are only such as are for *evil and seditious ends*, that the *Canon* forbids: If it has been, or may possibly be apply'd to any other, we have shew'd him, that such wrong Applications are incident to the best Laws, and we have nothing to do therewith. But that the *exorcising the possessed* (as He affirms) *comes in but by the bye*, is a gross abuse of his Reader: it will appear to be one main design of the *Canon* to all that read the Title or Body of it; and by which indeed, the whole about fasting may justly seem to be explain'd.

His next Section (as to what is new) is wholly taken up with the Consideration, whether our Oath be like that of a *Justice of Peace*. The matter has been already debated. And seeing He presently after gives it up to Mr. *Hoadly*, p. 336. we will contest it no further, especially seeing it is in this part that He grants those three things about the *Oath of Canonical Obedience*; which one would have thought might have at first ended the debate. We are also beholding to Mr. *Hoadly* for those Concessions: We fear
He

He had been too angry with us, to have granted us any thing.

We come now to the last Thing, the managing of the Government by Ecclesiastical Courts, &c. He begins with the Word Ordinary, which we had confin'd to the

Of the Ecclesiastical Courts.

Bishop, and He would extend to the Chancellor. We are since more fully inform'd about that Word. *It is a Judge that has Authority in his own Right, and not by Deputation: or that has exempt and immediate Jurisdiction.* We were right as to our selves, our Ordinary is our *Bishop* and none else: but in Places exempt from the *Bishop's* Jurisdiction (as there are many) some other Person may be the Ordinary. What He chiefly insists on here, is our being hamper'd by the Ecclesiastical Courts. He saith, p. 343. *it is well if we be not hamper'd in process of time.* He tells us, p. 345. *that Mr. Baxter complains of our being wofully hamper'd and fetter'd.* and p. 348. *that we have but hamper'd our selves.* We will fairly answer this, and then He will let us go.

1. That we are not in so much danger of being hamper'd by these Courts, as He pretends. We did not say that they have not their Faults, nor are other Courts free from them. He owes as much Subjection by his Oath of

Al-

Allegiance to the Queens Courts, as we do. He saith, p. 278. *He has sworn to a hearty contributing in his sphere to the defence and support of Her Majesty, Her Crown and Dignity under the direction of the Laws.* Now the *Crown and Dignity* of the Queen are most illustrious in Her Majesty's Courts, through which the *Laws* have their Course. And (by his Way of arguing) He has sworn Obedience to all the Tipstiffs, Solicitors, and Clerks in *Westminster Hall*; to be sure as much as we have to the *Attendants on the Ecclesiastical Courts*, and for the same doubty Reason set down, p. 343. because it is *through their Hands that the Orders* (or, as He calls it, the *Direction of the Laws*) of the Queen, in her Courts, *do pass, to which He is by Oath to be subject.* Thus easily is his loose way of arguing turn'd upon Himself. And though we do highly esteem of the Courts of *Westminster*; yet more have been *hamper'd* there (particularly in that Excellent and Honourable Court of Chancery) than ever were in the Ecclesiastical Courts that we know of. He would have all matters determin'd by Neighbours, without those Courts because of the difficulties which He sets down, p. 346. and would He not have other Differences put to References, where it may be; and Men not presently run to *Chancery*, where there is as much

much Charge and Difficulty? Yet we suppose He would be loth to have the Court of Chancery thrown down, which is able to oblige an obstinate Person to submit, when He will not stand to Neighbours-determinations but will force us, to the Charge and Trouble that He jests about. We are of his Mind about referring Matters to Neighbour Ministers, &c. where it may be done. Bishop Burnet adviseth so. *Pastoral care*, p. 191. *if we began much with private Applications and brought none into our Courts, till it was visible that all other means were unsuccessful—— we might again bring our Courts into esteem, &c.* A prudent Minister doing his Duty and trusting Providence, is not so liable to be hamper'd in these or other Courts, as He suggests. The dangers which He insinuates very seldom have happened, nor are likely to happen to us all our Days; nor, it may be, can happen unless under some illegal Administration. The danger from the Canon about Burial has never hapned that we know of these hundred Years (as was observ'd before) nor can any by that of kneeling (probably) happen now. And therefore such odd Suppositions, as *what if a Parent refuse to parly with his Minister?* p. 162. and *what if He refuse to be present?* &c. serve only to frighten Men (like Children) with Bug-bears. One thing He

He seems chiefly to insist on, as more than an imaginary Danger: And indeed so there would, if Mr. Calamy's bold Assertion were to be believ'd. He saith, p. 345. 'tis well known both that a Minister is liable to an Action for refusing to give the Sacrament to the most scandalous Person, when it is necessary to qualify Him for a place: And that there is no justifying in the Ecclesiastical Courts the exclusion of the most notorious evil Liver, if He can but secure the Favour of the Chancellour: Tea, though the Minister should have the Bishop concurring with Him. Take away the Equivocation in the first Words, and we shall seldom read a falser Passage in any Book. A Minister, He saith is liable to an Action. If He mean by that, that the Law condemns Him upon that Action (if He prove the excluded Person scandalous) it is to his purpose; if otherwise, He imposeth upon his Reader. Mr. Calamy is liable to an Action or Process against Him for Preaching a Sermon; but by the Act of Toleration (if He be qualify'd according to it) He will come off. Any Man is liable to an Action by any quarrelsome Neighbour; but the innocent will be acquitted. And so it is evidently in the Case before us. We shall set down this in Mr. Bennet's Words, that it may not be thought that we use softening Words which others will not own. De-

sence of Disc. of Scism, p. 74. He sets down the Rubricks before the Communion; and then Canon 26 at large: And argues thus; *The Common-prayer Book* (and consequently these Rubricks which require all the Clergy of the Establishment Church, to deny the Lord's Supper to Scandalous Persons) is confirm'd by Acts of Parliament. And the Book of Canons (and consequently Canon 26 which requires the Clergy not to admit notorious Offenders to the Communion) is confirm'd by the Letters Patent of King James I, which Confirmation makes them a part of the Statute-law of the Realm by 25 Hen. 8. Ch. 19. So that both the Ecclesiastical and Statute Laws do oblige the Clergy to deny the Lord's Supper to Scandalous Persons. Nor is there any the least Syllable, either of Ecclesiastical or Statute Law, which requires or allows the contrary. Thus speaking of a Report that Mr. Shepherd had been Suspended for denying the Lord's Supper to a Scandalous Person, He saith. I reply, that no Law in the World either of God or Man, does empower an English Bishop to Suspend the Clergyman, who acts according to the Canons and Rubricks of the Establishment Church. Nay, 'tis directly contrary to the Laws both of God and Man, for a Bishop to Suspend any Man for so acting. And if any Bishop does for this reason Suspend a Clergyman, such a Suspension is unjust, illegal, and arbitrary.

Nor

Nor is it to be charg'd upon our Ecclesiastical Constitution; any more than the unjust, illegal, or arbitrary Actions of a Justice of Peace, or other civil Officer, are to be charg'd upon our civil Constitution.

Having mentioned this Story about Mr. Shepherd's Suspension, we shall give his own Account thereof, which is as full to our purpose as the former. There was an open Contest between the Bishop and Mr. Shepherd about other matters: some time after which a scandalous Person having a Commission for a place, sent in his name in order to his coming to the Lord's Supper. Mr. Shepherd refus'd Him, as did two other Ministers of the neighbouring Parishes. Now, saith Mr. Shepherd, *Confid. on Mr. Bennet's Defence, p. 35. I was quickly after this suspended; not that the Suspension was laid upon that; the Ecclesiastical Courts have more Sense than to lay it upon that which will not bear it.* Nor is it in the least pretended in the Story, that the excluded Officer could have any remedy by Common-law: And if He had brought his Action, it could only have tended to his own Disgrace, if the Minister prove his Allegations against him. After all this, what Defence can Mr. Calamy make for such expressions as follow, p. 327. *That they are allowed to repel the Scandalous by our Constitution;*

tion, *I profess I do not know.* Then we profess, He is very Ignorant in this matter. He adds, *I believe Mr. Ollyffe would find it hard to defend Himself, if He should repel one from the Lord's Supper, though ever so Scandalous, who was bound by Law to come there, to qualify Himself for an Office.* And if what is said before do not make him believe otherwise, we fear it is because He only desires that it should be so, that He may have matter to confirm his charge. So that after all this clamour, there is no such danger, as He imagins: But we say further,

2. *If any such danger should happen, of being hamper'd in these Courts, in performance of our Duty, yet are we never the worse; nor ought we to be worse thought on, on that account.* He tells us, speaking of an imaginary danger by Can. 28. which we never knew did befall any; *that it is wiser and safer to avoid coming under any Obligation, than to run a hazard of being so hamper'd, p. 317.* What Obligation we lye under, has been shewn already (even to our duty in obeying our Governours, only in things lawful) as also, how little liable we are to be hamper'd by any Laws, under a righteous Administration: But to suppose it for the present, why should a Christian be so averse to suffering? Or why should a Fellow-Christian
up-

upbraid another with it? Is He sure that Himself shall never be expos'd to sufferings; that no ill neighbour shall ever vex Him with malicious Prosecutions in any of *Her Majesty's* Courts? Or, *is it wiser and safer to avoid coming under any Obligation* (by his Oath of Allegiance) *than to run the hazard of being so?* Or, doth He think, that Christian prudence doth oblige a Man always to take that mighty care of himself, as not to put himself in that State and Condition, wherein He may expose himself to any danger, or not so much as to a remote possibility of it; though He may hope to do never so much Service therein? What will become then of the prudence of our Soldiers? Of our Re-forming Magistrates and Societies? yea, what Condition can we be in, where we may not be expos'd to dangers? Is Mr. *Calamy* sure, that his actings in his Ministry shall never expose Him to hazards? We had told Him in our *Defence*, that *we never Reproach the Nonconformists with owning the Government by Oath, that once restrain'd them from the exercise of their Ministry: And now restrains them (as they complain) from Synods, &c.* In answer to which, He saith, p. 344. *This might pass for a kindness, if they could but prove, that the silent Ministers, as much own'd the Government in its Restraints, as the*

conforming Clergy are bound to do by the Constitution. We reply, that we think we did prove it, in the place He refers to : And for all his quibbling with [*in their Restraints*] the same belongs to the one as to the other : and if there were any differences, it was incumbent on Him to assign them ; we know of none. And if He takes it to be a *Reflection upon the Constitution*, to suppose that a Conscientious Minister may be expos'd to hardships therein, it is jeering not arguing. We never thought it perfect ; nor that ever it can be, while the Governours are but meer Men. But ordinarily the danger comes not from the Government or Constitution ; but from some faulty Administration thereof, or some malicious prosecutions by wicked Men, or by an imprudent carriage in some Ministers, who yet are truly honest and conscientious.

But He has one Quibble at the close, p. 348. that *if we deny any thing to the Courts that we cannot in conscience comply with, we give them the Advantage of urging us with a Promise and Oath in the Case*. By which equivocating Expression He may hope some will understand Him, *that we are then chargeable with the breach of our Oath and Promise*, and then He has his aim. Not that He Himself thinks so, for He has declar'd the

X

con-

contrary in exprefs words, p. 337. and He can only come off with faying, that they may *urge us* with it, *i. e.* they may blacken us, and call us vile names: and do as He has done, and represent things otherwise than they are by Reproaches and Calumnies. But if we cannot bear a Scoff, we are poor Soldiers of Jesus Christ.

When He takes his leave of us, He saith, p. 352. *that we are our selves charg'd as mis-representers by the true Sons of the Church.* But as it may be He do's not believe those, whom he here means, to be so much the true Sons of the Church, as we: So He has not produc't any one of them to contradict our Sense, in any of the main parts of our *Defence*. And as we verily believe Mr. *Hoadly* had no respect to us, in the words Mr. *Calamy* sets down as an Admonition to us; so we have shewn, that what He insinuates from them is groundless, and a most egregious Slander. He then chargeth us with *vindicating unwarrantable Impositions*; whereas we only shew'd that the compliance with the things impos'd is *warrantable*, and we medled not with *unwarrantable Impositions*. And now, that the way which He has taken is *likely to redress any Corruption, when providence offers opportunity*, it can be no otherwise but by accident, but is in its own nature highly pro-

provoking. And we judge what we have done, to tend a great deal more to the desired union, by abating the Heats on both sides.

To conclude, Whereas Mr. Calamy presents us, p. 353. with some words from Mr. Hoadly (though most unjustly apply'd to us) in that which He calls a serious Admonition; *I shall take the freedom to return Mr. Calamy an Admonition in the words of Mr. Baxter, which I hope He will admit with a Brotherly Respect.*

Cure of Church Divisions, p. 409. *There is none of those Ministers of Christ, whom you Reproach, but is to be serviceable to his Master for the saving of Mens Souls; and you are instruments to block up their way, and to turn away the Hearts of People from their Doctrine.* — Did you see the ugliness of ignorant peevish Contentious Zeal, as contrary to holy Light and Love, you would think you saw a Devil spitting out Fire and Brimstone. And if you knew how every word of Obloquy do's tend to infect the Hearers with the same vice, and kill their Love, and lead them into Divisions, you would take heed for the sake of others. — In a word, such carnal courses of Teachers do make or harden carnal Professors, to be one for Paul, and another for Apollos, and another for Cephas; but few sin-

X 2

cerely

cerely or prudently for Christ. So that instead of Holiness, Love and Concord, we have in almost all company, little but ignorant censorious Wrangling, at the Opinions of those, that they were never acquainted with; or at the controverted Practices, or Circumstances of Worship, which are not suited to their prejudice and Custom, and of which they never desired to be the impartial Hearers of a just Account.

F I N I S.

ERRATA.

PAGE 5. line 3. read *is this*. p. 7. l. 18. after *speaks* r. *kindly*. p. 15. l. 4. after *prov'd* r. *they had*. p. 16. l. 11. after *of* r. *one of*. p. 41. l. 18. after *do* r. *not*. p. 88. l. 17. after *Words*: r. *And*. p. 126. l. 25. for *intended* r. *extended*. p. 134. l. 17. for *Words* r. *Word*. p. 144. l. 19. r. *Blessings*. p. 152. l. 20 and 22. for *revieve* r. *revive*. p. 172. l. 12. after *make* r. *no*. p. 180. l. 20. r. *another*. p. 205. l. 5. for *it* r. *unbaptiz'd*. p. 237. l. 18. for *of* r. *notice of*. p. 268. l. 24. for *formally* r. *formerly*. p. 269. l. 29. r. *not be*.

Advertisement.

A Letter to the Reverend Mr. John Ollyffe, touching the Declaration of Assent and Consent to the Liturgy and the Imposition of certain things scrupled therein.

Printed for Richard Wilkin.

An INDEX of some Peculiarities in Mr. Calamy's manner of writing in this Controversie. (The Figures note the Page of this Defence in which Mr. Calamy's Words are quoted or referr'd to.)

HE largely sets down *Histories* and *Authorities*. 1. that prove what we had never deny'd, viz. the difference between *High* and *Low Churchmen* ever since the *Reformation*. see p. 21. that some have formerly scrupled *Subscription*, p. 102. that private *Baptism* is to be administr'd in case of sickness, p. 166. 2. that prove the contrary to what He produceth them for, viz. his *History* about the extent of the *Rubrick* for *Kneeling*, p. 192. about the *Canons* and *Oath* to the *Bishops* in former Ages, p. 249.

II. He vehemently argues against what He yields to, viz. the necessity of *Determinations* of *Circumstances* in the Church, p. 47, 164.

The INDEX.

the power of Magistrates in Church affairs, p. 71. the Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, p. 132. the Usefulness of Godfathers, p. 157. the Lawfulness of the use of the sign of the Cross, p. 179. the Identity of Orders and Degrees, p. 198. the Limitations of the Oath of Canonical obedience. p. 259.

III. He groundlessly insinuates. 1. what He dares not assert, viz. *that the sign of the Cross is made with us a means of Grace, p. 175.* 2. what He never goes about to prove, viz. *that the Terms of Conformity are by Him explain'd according to the sense of the generality of Conformists, p. 25. that we are to consent to the Thoughts and undecar'd Designs of Imposers, p. 93, 105. that the Imposers intended to exclude those who were for bare submitting, p. 98.*

IV. He frequently makes use of Jest and Flouts. 1. to be instead of Answers, viz. *in the case of the Salvation of Infants, p. 130. about the difference of Orders and Degrees, p. 197.* 2. to darken the Argument that He is upon, viz. *about the several ways of making the sign of the Cross, like to divers Greek Letters, p. 48. about Jewd Boys coming to Confirmation, p. 133.* 3. to prepossess his Reader against us, viz. *by excluding us from Preferments, p. 19. by his Ecclesiastical Pound, p. 203. & passim.*

V. He

The INDEX.

V. He confidently affirms things, contrary to plain evidence. 1. in matters of fact, viz. *that Mr. Humphreys had answer'd us in what we produc't from him, p. 44. that the Commissioners at the Savoy had own'd that the Liturgy excluded them that did not kneel, p. 187, 194.* 2. in matters of Law, viz. *That Canons are not confirm'd and allowed by 25 Hen. VIII. p. 266. that Ministers have not power to exclude scandalous Persons from the Communion, p. 301.* 3. in matters of Argument, viz. *by dictating a sense of the Words of the Church contrary to the open declaration of all the learned Men in it since the Reformation, p. 178.*

VI. He gravely gives us matters of fact (upon which the proof of his Arguments depends) from private hands, or without citing any Authors, and which He knew we could not examine the truth of, viz. *about the Commons rejecting the Lords Amendment, p. 105. about Dr. Sherman's Recantation, p. 114. about the Discourse between the two Archbishops, p. 205.*

VII. He unkindly useth many personal Reflections and some scurrilous ones. 1. as if we had been insincere in our respect to the ejected Ministers, p. 8. 2. as if we were insincere in our Conformity, p. 18. viz. as *averting*

The INDEX

ing to things which we were as much dissatisfy'd with as the Nonconformists, p. 116. as perswading others to what we our selves do not allow, p. 120. He Reflects on us, as using the Scripture as Biddle do's, tho' He pretends not to prove that we had put a false sense on any one text, p. 132, 219. as being against Week day Lectures, tho' we had not hinted any thing about them p. 295. as vilifying the Canons tho' we had vindicated them, p. 284, 287.

VIII. He triflingly quibbles with words ambiguously us'd, viz. that the sign of the Cross signifies Christ's merits, p. 175. the sense of the Church, p. 191, 208. the room of Holy Scriptures, p. 224. the being lyable to an Action, p. 300. his being loth to bind himself with an Oath, p. 259, 293. our being charg'd with the breach of an Oath, p. 261, 305.

IX. He falsely repeats our words in our former Defence, viz. quoting by halves, or leaving out what was necessary to explain our sense, p. 94, 95. and wresting our words contrary to the express sense and meaning plainly set down, p. 183.

X. He carelessly opposeth the Nonconformists whom He pretends to Defend. I. the old Nonconformists, who took the Oath of

The INDEX.

Canonical Obedience, p. 262. 2. the ejected Ministers, viz. about the Dependency of Churches, p. 68. about submitting to Governours in lawful things, p. 73. 3. the united Ministers about Reordination, p. 30. and the regard due to Synods, p. 69. 4. Chiefly Mr. Baxter (whose Life He do's abridge) about Reordination, p. 31. Rites and Ceremonies, p. 52. Extent of Christian Liberty, p. 81. Regeneration in Baptism, p. 136. the Order of Bishops, p. 202. the Oath of Canonical obedience. p. 262. yea, as to the very Amendments that were desired by them, p. 139.

XI. He unhappily urgeth a way of reasoning that falls upon and hits Himself. 1. He eagerly pleads against submitting to Impositions, yet, yields to an imposed Subscription to 36 Articles, as the Terms of having liberty to preach, p. 226. seems ready to submit to most of the Impositions complained of, if He were in the Circumstances of the old Puritans, p. 10. declares the readiness of the Nonconformists, (even two thirds of them, A. 1689) to submit to many Impositions in order to their coming into the Church, p. 84, 162. vindicates Occasional Conformity to Impositions, even tho' it do's encourage Imposers, p. 82. practiseth statedly divers Ceremonies impos'd, even that accounted, by some Nonconformists, the worst of all,

The INDEX.

all, p. 51, 86. 2. He invents Hardships and Difficulties out of which He can by no means extricate Himself, viz. *about Subjects Oaths to their Governours*, p. 269. and *Submission to their Courts*, p. 298.

XII. He notoriously useth divers Weights and Measures, viz. *in refusing the common acceptation of words at one time, that He urgeth at another*, p. 100. with, p. 121. *refusing the sense of the Church (which He urgeth as a Rule on others) in his own Subscribing the Sixth Article of the Church of England*, p. 221, 226. and the Eighth Article, p. 239. *in the consequences which He cites of being bound to all the Laws of our Governours*, p. 273.

XIII. He wittingly neglects the *Explication of our Defence*, presented to Him, in a *Printed Letter*, p. 129, and in a *written Letter*, p. 213.

XIV. He manifestly occasions the Abuses that He reflects upon, and inveighs against, viz. *the Carelesness of Godfathers*, p. 158. *the Opposition to Union*; by *urging Doctrines inconsistent with any hopes of it*, p. 76. by *occasioning the continuance of the Impositions that obstruct it*, p. 84.

XV. He

The INDEX.

XV. He pretendedly gives that for one capital Cause of the Ejection of the Non-conformists, which do's not appear to be once thought on, till above 20 years after their Ejection, p. 262.

XVI. He strangely objects the danger of Suffering, as an Argument to Christians and Ministers against doing their duty, p. 304

XVII. He apparently is inconsistent with Himself. 1. in his Reflections : for not only, *doth a Dissenter endeavour to render odious our allowed Respect to tender Consciences, scrupling Kneeling, &c. which a while ago was needed, desired, and commended by Dissenters*, p. 171, 195. but even *He who so much inveighs against the stiff Men for refusing Alterations in favour of Dissenters, do's reproach us for our Desires thereof*, p. 120, 173, 187. yea, though *He applauds the old Puritans for what He condemns in us*, p. 11, 117. 2. In his Arguments, *He grounds Nonconformity on his sense of Assent and Consent as to a Book inspired ; yet tells us that if that were waved, Subscription would be as much scrupled as ever*, p. 103. *tho' He has not thought fit to contest our sense of Subscription, in a Book wherein He pretends to give the whole Cause in debate*, p. 102. and when he seems to agree with the conforming Puritans who
made

The INDEX.

made that Subscription, p. 10. Especially as to the Oath of Canonical Obedience; this last Book disagrees, 1. with his tenth Chapter, viz. in amply allowing what there he deny'd; p. 254. 2. With it self, viz. in contradicting the Allowances He do's so amply make, p. 258. in putting quite contrary Senses upon the Words of the Oath, p. 280.

5 JY 61